

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1900.

CORYAT AND THE PARDONER'S TALE.

THE famous porphyry figures that stand at the corner of the Treasury of St. Mark, in Venice, at the left of the Porta della Carta of the Doge's Palace,¹ are commonly thought to have been brought from Acre, or at all events from the East, in the thirteenth century.² The learned are not agreed as to what or whom they represent. The populace, however, are convinced that they are four of the earliest founders of the city, "i quali abbracciandosi a due a due esclamavano: Saremo amici!"³ This is quite as good as the conjecture of the sixteenth-century engineer Girolamo Maggi (d. 1572), who, confessing that nothing is known about the figures "except that they came from Greece," conjectures that they represent Harmodius and Aristogiton, and were set up as an object lesson in patriotism.⁴

Evelyn suggests a better story in his *Diary*, June, 1645:

"At the corner of the Church are inserted into the maine wall four figures as big as life cut in porphyrie, which they say are the images of four brothers who poysoned one another, by which meanes there escheated to the Republick that vast treasury of relicques now belonging to the Church."⁵

But it is to Coryat's *Crudities* that we must turn for the whole of the legend. Coryat heard it at Venice in 1608.

"Also there is a third thing to be seene in that place, which is very worthy your obser-

¹ The position of the reliefs may be seen in the plate that faces p. 3 of the text of Pasini's *Il Tesoro di San Marco*, Venice, 1886. A fine picture of them may be found in Ongania's *Dettagli di Altari, Monumenti, Scultura ecc. della Basilica di San Marco riprodotti dal vero in eliotipia da C. Jacobi*, Venice, 1881-7, vol. V, plate 191 (133).

² F. Zanotto, in Cicognara, Diedo, and Selva, *Le Fabbriche, e i Monumenti cospicui di Venezia*, 2d. ed., Venice, 1838, I, 14.

³ Pittre's *Archivio per lo Studio delle Tradizioni Popolari*, xv, 138.

⁴ *Hieronymi Magii Miscellaneorum* lib. ii, cap. 6, in Gru-ter's *Thesaurus Criticus*, II, 1325-6 (Frankf., 1604).

⁵ Bray's 2d. ed., 1819, I, 187.

uation, being neare to the foresaid gallows, and pourtrayed in the corner of the wall as you goe into the Dukes Palace. The pourtraitures of foure Noble Gentlemen of Albania that were brothers, which are made in porphyrie stone with their fawchions by their sides, and each couple consulting priuately together by themselves, of whom this notable history following is reported, These Noble brothers came from Albania together in a ship laden with great store of riches. After their arriual at Venice which was the place whereunto they were bound, two of them went on shore, and left the other two in the ship. They two that were landed entred into a consultation and conspiracy how they might dispatch their other brothers which remayned in the ship, to the end they might gaine all the riches to themselves. Whereupon they bought themselves some drugges to that purpose, and determined at a banquet to present the same to their other brothers in a potion or otherwise. Likewise on the other side those two brothers that were left in the shippe whispered secretly amongst themselves how they might make away their brothers that were landed, that they might get all the wealth to themselves. And thereupon procured meanes accordingly. At last this was the finall issue of these consultations. They that had beene at land presented to their other brothers certaine poysoned drugges at a banquet to the end to kill them. Which those brothers did eate and dyed therewith, but not incontinently. For before they died, they ministred a certaine poysoned march-pane or some such other thing at the very same banquet to their brothers that had been at land; both which poysons when they had thoroughly wrought their effects vpon both couples, all foure dyed shortly after. Whereupon the Signiory of Venice seised vpon all their goods as their owne, which was the first treasure that euer Venice possessed, and the first occasion of enriching the estate; and in memoriall of that vncharitable and vnbrotherly conspiracy, hath erected the pourtraitures of them in prophyrie as I said before in two seuerall couples consulting together. I confess I never read this history, but many Gentlemen of very good account in Venice, both Englishmen and others, reported it vnto me for an absolute truth. And Sir Henry Wotton himselfe our Kings most Honorable, learned, and thrise-worthy Ambassador in Venice, counselled me once when he admitted me to passe with him in his Gondola (which I will euer most thankfully acknowledge for one of his vnderdeserued fauours he afforded me in that noble City) to take speciall obseruation of those two couples of men with fawchions

or curtleaxes by their sides, pourtrayed in the gate wall of the Dukes Palace, as being a thing most, worthy to be considered. Therefore, although I have not read this thing that I have before related in any authentick history, I for mine own part doe as farre forth beleue it, hauing receiued it from so good Authours, as if I had found it in a history of sufficient authority."⁶

This will be immediately recognized as a version of the legend which forms the plot of Chaucer's *Pardoner's Tale*, and of which various versions—Italian and other—have been already collected.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.

DIE ANTEZEDENTEN DER HELENA IN GOETHE'S FAUST.

DER mir leider erst anfangs März 1900¹ bekannt gewordene Aufsatz von Adolph Gerber—er ist bereits im April 1899 in dieser Zeitschrift (Vol. xiv, No. 4, S. 204-215) erschienen ("The Homunculus-Helena Theory, and the Evolution of the Helena Drama and its Antecedents")—veranlasst mich keineswegs zu einer Widerlegung im einzelnen: dazu hätte das Auftreten des Schreibers doch dem eines wissenschaftlich Arbeitenden angemessener sein müssen. Ich werde mich möglichst auf die Sache selbst beschränken und nur gelegentlich Gerbers von seltsamem Geschmack zeugende Art des Urteillfallens daneben stellen, um zu zeigen, wie berechtigt mein Verfahren ist. Wer sich, statt sachlich zu bleiben, zu leidenschaftlichen Invectiven hinreissen lässt, erweckt von vornherein ein starkes Misstrauen in die Tüchtigkeit seiner Sache: dieses Misstrauen erweist sich Gerber gegenüber nur zu sehr als gerechtfertigt.

I.

Es handelt sich zunächst um zwei Fragen: 1. ganz allgemein: Wie verhält sich Goethes dichterische Ausführung der Faustdichtung zu seinen Schematen?—und 2. speziell: Wie verhalten sich die Schemata der Antezedentien des Helenadramas zu des Dichters Ausführung?

⁶ Coryat's *Cruities*, 1611, pp. 189-91; ed. of 1776, I, 239-41.

¹ Professor Valentin's article was received in April, but its publication was unavoidably delayed.—Ed.

1. Die sämtlichen früheren Entwürfe, die Schemata sowohl, die Pläne skizzieren, als auch Einzelentwürfe von Ausführungen einzelner Stellen, also alles das, was man jetzt als "Paralipomena" bezeichnet,² haben einen grossen Wert, wenn es sich darum handelt, nachzuweisen, was Goethe in einer ganz bestimmten Zeit, mag sie nun von uns datiert oder nicht datiert werden können, irgendeinmal geplant hat. Gelingt es, da wo sie noch fehlt, eine sichere Datierung nach und nach zu gewinnen, so ist für die Geschichte der Entwicklung der Goethischen Faustdichtung die Existenz der Paralipomena von höchster Bedeutung, und ihr Wert ist unter diesem Gesichtspunkt ein ganz unschätzbarer. Handelt es sich dagegen um das Verständnis der fertigen Dichtung, so schwindet dieser historische Wert selbstverständlich dahin: aber auch ihr Inhalt kann keinen Aufschluss über den Inhalt der fertigen Dichtung geben, und zwar aus dem Grunde, weil es Tatsache ist, dass kein einziger Entwurf sich mit der Ausführung deckt. Ja sogar die einzelnen Motive sind in der Regel geändert, und selbst wo der Dichter sie beibehalten hat, sind sie doch so umgestaltet und anders gewendet worden, dass die Dichtung, und zwar speziell die des sogenannten zweiten Teils, sich mit den Entwürfen durchaus nicht deckt. Diese Tatsache hebt jetzt auch Pniower in seinem trefflichen Buche³ (so darf und muss man urteilen, auch wenn man mit manchen seiner Excurse nicht einverstanden ist) so hervor:

"Genau deckt sich keins der Schemata (104-106) mit der Ausführung, wie wir durchweg beobachten, dass Goethe bei der dichterischen Production selbst die in den Entwürfen niedergelegten Absichten ändert" (S. 207.)

Goethe war sich dieser Tatsache selbst sehr wohl bewusst. Gerade mit Beziehung auf die Klassische Walpurgisnacht erzählt Eckermann (14. Februar 1830: bei Pniower, wo alle bezüglichen Stellen jetzt am bequemsten nach-

² Eine eingehende Untersuchung habe ich diesem Gegenstande gewidmet in der Abhandlung: "Goethes erste Walpurgisnacht und ihre Paralipomena," *Euphorion* II, S. 100-118.

³ Goethes Faust, Zeugnisse und Exkurse zu seiner Entstehungsgeschichte, Berlin, 1899.

gelesen werden können, weshalb ich ihn gern hinzuzitiere, N. 783, S. 246):

"Goethe erzählte mir von seiner 'Klassischen Walpurgisnacht,' dass er damit jeden Tag weiter komme, und dass ihm wunderbare Dinge über die Erwartung gelängen."

Denken wir uns das, was er als die Erwartung bezeichnet, als das in den Schematen Niedergelegte—aber erstens sind uns freilich nicht alle Entwürfe erhalten, und zweitens arbeitet ein schaffender Genius unablässig weiter, auch wenn er nicht alles gleich oder überhaupt als Entwurf zu Papier bringt,—so sagt also Goethe selbst ganz ausdrücklich, dass auch bei der künstlerischen Durchführung der dichterische Genius immer weiter arbeitet und den Schematen gegenüber Neues schafft, und dass dies Neue gerade "wunderbare Dinge" sind, an die er früher noch nicht gedacht hat. Aber selbst wenn Goethe das nicht ausdrücklich selbst bezeugte, so ergäbe sich die Notwendigkeit dieser Thatsache aus der Natur des künstlerischen Schaffens überhaupt. Das hat jeder Künstler auf seinem Gebiete der Kunst erfahren: je lebendiger der werdende neue Organismus, wie es jedes Kunstwerk in seiner Schöpfungsperiode erscheint, in die Entwicklung kommt, desto mehr macht der Künstler die Entdeckung, wie dieser Organismus gleichsam von selbst aus dem Unbewussten der schaffenden Seele herauswächst und neue Sprossen treibt, und gerade dieses Wachstum stellt uns recht eigentlich das Geniale in dem künstlerischen Schaffen dar.⁴ Als Zeugnis eines, der aus eigenster Erfahrung mitreden darf, führe ich hier den Passus an, den Schiller an Körner schreibt, und zwar am 27. Dezember 1796, also in der Zeit der eifrigsten schöpferischen Thätigkeit Schillers und seines dichterischen Gefährten, Goethes: es handelt sich um Wallenstein. Schiller sagt:

"Über dem Anstaltmachen und Meditieren kam ich in die Ausführung selbst hinein, und finde, dass selbst der Plan, bis auf einen gewissen Punkt, nur durch die Ausführung selbst reif werden kann. Ohne diese ist man

⁴ Diese Thatsache habe ich in meiner Festrede zu Goethes hundertfünfzigjähriger Geburtsfeier näher für Goethe ausgeführt (Vgl. Erich Schmidt und Veit Valentin, Festreden bei der Akademischen Feier in Frankfurt am Main zu Goethes 150. Geburtstag. Veranstaltet vom freien Deutschen Hochstift und der Goethe-Gesellschaft. Frankfurt, 1899.

wirklich in Gefahr, kalt, trocken und steif zu werden, da doch der Plan selbst aus dem Leben springen muss."

Wer daher Entwürfe zum Beweismittel für die ausgeführte Dichtung machen will, wer annehmen kann, der schaffende Genius fühle sich je durch einen früheren Plan gebunden und betrachte diesen nicht vielmehr nur als einen Stützpunkt, von dem aus er einen neuen, ihn höher tragenden Aufschwung nehmen kann, der—nun, der steht auf dem Standpunkt Gerbers, der seine kleinlichen Anschauungen vom künstlerischen Schaffen als Basis nimmt und sich erdreistet, eine Theorie, die den für den Dichter veralteten Schematen nicht entspricht, sondern auf den Thatsachen des fertigen Kunstwerkes beruht, ihrem Urheber vorzuhalten als "nothing but a fantastic lucubration of his own brain!"

2. Die zweite, specielle Frage ist weiter die: Wie verhalten sich die Schemata der Antezedentien des Helenadramas zu des Dichters Ausführung?

Für jeden, der Augen hat und lesen kann, ist es offenkundig, dass das Helenadrama abgeschlossen war, als Goethe sich dazu wendete, die "Antezedentien" des Helenadramas auszuführen, d.h. die zwei ersten Akte des sogenannten zweiten Teiles, und damit das dichterisch zu gestalten, was er in der "Ankündigung" zum Helenadrama zum Verständnis dieser Episode der Faustdichtung hatte mitteilen wollen,

"damit die grosse Kluft zwischen dem bekannten jammervollen Abschluss des ersten Teiles und dem Eintritt einer griechischen Heldenfrau einigermaßen überbrückt werde."

Nachdem die Ausführung des ersten Aktes vollendet war (1829), wächst die Sorge, ob es ihm auch mit dem zweiten Akte gelingen werde:

"Meine einzige Sorge und Bemühung ist nun, die zwei ersten Akte fertig zu bringen, damit sie sich an den dritten, welcher eigentlich das bekannte Drama, Helena betitelt, in sich fasst, klüglich und weislich anschliessen mögen" (Goethe an Zelter, 16. Dez., 1829: Pniower N. 737 S. 237).

Aber dieser "klügliche und weisliche Anschluss" sollte eben diesem Helenadrama eine ganz andere Stellung geben, als es sie durch sein gesondertes Erscheinen hatte

erlangen können: bei diesem war es bezeichnet als: "Helena, klassisch-romantische Phantasmagorie. Zwischenspiel zu Faust." Schon am 21. November 1827 schreibt Goethe an Zelter:

"Der zweite Teil des Faust (d.h. hier die zwei ersten Akte) fährt fort, sich zu gestalten; die Aufgabe ist hier wie bei Helena: das Vorhandene so zu bilden und zu richten, dass es zum Neuen passt und klappt, wobei manches zu verwerfen, manches umzuarbeiten ist" (Pniower N. 588, S. 206).

Goethe erklärt hier also ganz ausdrücklich, dass auch bei dem schon Vorhandenen eine Umbildung stattfindet, damit es zu dem Neuen "passt und klappt." Dies ist aber nur dann denkbar, wenn die künstlerische Gestaltung nicht bloß eine Ausführung des früher gemachten Schemas bringt, sondern der Dichter zugleich von seinem Rechte Gebrauch machte, solches hinzuzufügen, was früher in dem Entwurfe überhaupt noch nicht vorhanden war, und im Hinblick auf das Neue auch das Alte, wie es frühere Schemata gaben, sachgemäss und der neuen dichterischen Gestaltung entsprechend umzugestalten. In welchem Sinne diese Umgestaltung stattgefunden hat, lehrt der Brief an Zelter vom 24. Januar 1828:

"Ich fahre fort an dieser Arbeit, denn ich möchte gar zu gern die zwei ersten Akte fertig bringen, damit Helena als dritter Akt ganz ungezwungen sich anschliesse, und genugsam vorbereitet, nicht mehr phantasmagorisch und eingeschoben, sondern in ästhetisch-vernunftgemässer Folge sich erweisen könnte."

Und wie Goethe dem alten Freunde am 4. Januar 1831 berichten kann. "die zwei ersten Akte sind fertig," da fügt er hinzu:

"Helena tritt zu Anfang des dritten Aktes nicht als Zwischenspielerin, sondern als Heroine ohne Weiteres auf" (Pniower N. 846, S. 254-5).

Sie kann das aber weil sie nun "genugsam vorbereitet" ist, weil der dritte Akt dem zweiten "ganz ungezwungen" sich anschliesst, freilich nicht ohne "etwas aufzurathen" zu geben. Dass in der That gerade diese zwei ersten Akte die Aufgabe haben sollten, die "Helena" verständlicher zu machen, beweist die schon vom 23. September 1827 herrührende Stelle im Konzepte eines Briefes an K. I. L. Iken:

"Hierbei darf nicht unerwähnt bleiben, dass ich mit der dritten Lieferung meiner Werke zu Ostern die ersten Szenen des zweiten Teiles von Faust mitzuteilen gedenke, um auf manche Weise ein frisches Licht auf Helena, welche als der dritte Akt des Ganzen anzusehen ist, zurückzuspiegeln."

Diese Absicht hätte bei dem Dichter überhaupt nicht entstehen können, wenn nicht der innigste sachliche Zusammenhang zwischen den zwei ersten Akten und dem dritten, dem "Helenadrama," bestanden hätte, eine Absicht, die freilich, sobald es sich um ein künstlerisches Ganzes handelt, für jeden denkenden Menschen von vornherein selbstverständlich ist.

Dieser ganze Prozess zeigt eine beständige "Gestaltung, Umgestaltung," neben der die Schemata ganz zurücktreten. Will man unter Ablehnung dieser Thatsache das Dogma aufstellen, dass mit Abschluss des Helenadramas eine Abänderung der beim Abschluss dieses Dramas fertigen Entwürfe für die zwei ersten Akte nicht mehr möglich gewesen sei, so müsste man eine solche kindische Behauptung für unmöglich halten, wenn nicht ganz ausdrücklich bei Gerber zu lesen wäre, der von mir nachgewiesene sachliche Zusammenhang zwischen Homunculus und Helena sei unmöglich, "because the time for further changes had expired with the completion of the drama" (1899, S. 213): also weil das Helenadrama 1827 fertig war, durfte Goethe an den vor 1827 gemachten Entwürfen für den ersten und zweiten Akt, den Antezedentien der Helena, nichts mehr ändern! Auch eine solche Behauptung ist ein Dogma, und von den Dogmen heisst es: *credo quia absurdum*.
II.

Wenn man die Dinge vernünftig prüft, so ergeben sich zwei wohl zu unterscheidende Gesichtspunkte für das Verständnis der Antezedentien der Helena und ihres Auftretens im dritten Akte: die Thatsache der Wiedererscheinung der bereits längst abgeschiedenen und nur noch in der Unterwelt als Schatten existierenden Helena, und die Art, wie diese Wiedererscheinung bewirkt wird. In der ersten Thatsache bleibt sich Goethe, trotzdem sich Helena sonst im Laufe der Jahre vielfach "gestaltet und umgestaltet" hat (26. Mai 1827 an Nees von Esenbeck: Pniower N. 527, S.

188), dennoch stets gleich, und zwar nicht erst seit 1824 und 1826, sondern schon seit September, 1800, als Goethe Schillern verkünden konnte:

"Glücklicherweise konnte ich diese acht Tage die Situationen festhalten, von denen Sie wissen, und meine Helena ist wirklich aufgetreten."

Eine folgerichtige Anwendung des Gerberschen Dogmas müsste nun erklären, dass seit 1800, d. h. seitdem das Helenadrama in seiner unverrückbaren Basis festgelegt ist, keine Umgestaltung der Antezedentien der Helena hätte stattfinden können: nur hat aber leider Schiller Goethes damalige Pläne mit ins Grab genommen, und die späteren Entwürfe zeigen beständige Umgestaltung—aber was kümmert uns weiter das Dogma Gerbers: es ist so kläglich! Seit Schillers Tagen nun steht die Thatsache des Wiedererscheinens in der stets festgehaltenen Art des Auftretens fest, aber das Auftreten selbst sollte noch im Anschluss an Legende und Puppenspiel durch die Beihilfe des Teufels stattfinden. Damit tritt der zweite Gesichtspunkt in sein Recht durch die Frage, wie diese Wiederbelebung bewirkt werden soll. Geschieht sie durch den Teufel, so wird mit der klassisch schönen Gestalt der Helena der mittelalterlich hässliche Teufelsspuk unmittelbar und unlösbar verbunden: dieser Umstand widersteht Goethen so sehr, dass er für ihn der Grund wird, die Arbeit an der Helenadichtung noch zu Schillers Lebzeiten aufzugeben: er lässt sie gerade an der Stelle im Stich, wo durch das Eingreifen der trojanischen Mädchen die Teufelsnatur der Phorkyas zur Offenbarung ihres Wesens veranlasst wird. Noch in der "Skizze der Urgestalt," die, 1816 "sorgfältiger geschrieben" (Pniower N. 315, S. 115), bestimmt war, in das 18. Buch von "Dichtung und Wahrheit" eingereiht zu werden, und die infolge von Eckermanns Eingreifen (1824, und hier weiterhin mit diesem Jahre angeführt) ungedruckt blieb—Gerber bezeichnet sie naiver Weise als "Urplan von 1775," während schon Erich Schmidt in seiner besonnenen Weise darauf hingewiesen hat:

"die Erzählung bietet gewiss z.T. eine Ergänzung alter Intentionen durch die nachschaffende und verbindende Phantasie" und

"Bruchstücke aus jener Frühzeit 1775 sind nicht erhalten"—

heisst es, Faust

"verlangt dass der Tausendkünstler (Mephistopheles) sie herbeischaffen und ihm in die Arme liefern solle. Es finden sich Schwierigkeiten. Helena gehört dem Orkus und kann durch Zauberkünste wohl herausgelockt, aber nicht festgehalten werden"—

was Gerber nicht abhält, das weitere Dogma aufzustellen, dass

"corporeal being is implied in the release and not, as Valentin surmises, obtained by the "Zaubermittel" of a sojourn in a certain place!"

Goethe selbst freilich sagt ausdrücklich, dass "Zauberkünste" die Helena hervorlocken müssen: das unternimmt Mephistopheles, und wie die Helena erschienen ist, sagt Goethe weiter: "durch einen magischen Ring ist ihr die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben"—ist ein "magischer" Ring kein "Zaubermittel" und wirken somit nicht Zauberkünste und Zaubermittel zusammen,—die Zauberkünste, um Helena aus dem Orkus hervorzulocken, die Zaubermittel, um sie auf der Erde festzuhalten, indem ihr durch Zaubermittel die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben wird, ohne die sie auf der Erde weder verweilen, noch ihre Aufgabe, sich mit Faust zu verbinden, lösen kann? Und solche Thatsachen abzuleugnen hat Gerber "the boldness," um seinen eleganten Ausdruck zu gebrauchen. Wie kläglich!

Aber die enge Verbindung zwischen Helena und Mephistopheles, die Goethe schon zur Zeit Schillers abgestossen hatte, löst sich zum Glück für die Fortführung der Faustdichtung. Schon in der ungedruckt gebliebenen Ankündigung zur Helena vom 10. Juni 1826 heisst es:

"dem alten, auf die ältere von Faust umgehende Fabel gegründeten Puppenspiel gemäss, sollte im zweiten Teil meiner Tragödie gleichfalls die Verwegenheit Fausts dargestellt werden, womit er die schönste Frau aus Griechenland in die Arme begehrt. Dieses war nun nicht durch Blocksbergsgenossen, ebensowenig durch die hässlichen nordischen Hexen und Vampyren nahverwandte Enyo zu erreichen, sondern, wie in dem zweiten Teile alles auf einer höheren und edleren Stufe gefunden wird, in den Bergklüften Thessaliens unmittelbar bei dämonischen Sibyllen zu suchen, welche durch merkwürdige Verhandlungen es zuletzt dahin vermittelten, dass

Persephone der Helena erlaubte, wieder in die Wirklichkeit zu treten."

Hier ist die hochbedeutsame Veränderung eingetreten, dass Faust selbst handeln muss, und dass Helena durch Persephone entlassen wird: aber das Zaubermittel, sie auf der Erde zu halten, bleibt noch unangetastet. Nur tritt an Stelle des magischen Ringes (1824) die Bedingung, dass Helena "sich nirgends als auf dem eigentlichen Boden von Sparta des Lebens wieder erfreuen solle;" ebenso müsse alles Übrige, sowie das Gewinnen ihrer Liebe, "auf menschlichem Wege zugehen." Das ist freilich nur möglich, wenn Helena ein Wesen von Fleisch und Blut geworden, wenn sie also nicht mehr leeres Schattenbild geblieben ist. Die Wiedergewinnung dieser Körperlichkeit war früher an das Zaubermittel des magischen Ringes geknüpft: jetzt geschieht sie durch den Aufenthalt in beschränktem Kreise, der als "Zaubergränze" bezeichnet wird: streift Helena den Ring ab (1824), übertritt sie die Zaubergränze (1826), so entschwindet das Körperliche, und der Schatten geht selbstverständlich sofort wieder in den Orkus. Ein Schatten ohne Körperlichkeit hat auf der Oberwelt keine Daseinsmöglichkeit.

Es ist keine Frage, dass die Erteilung der Körperlichkeit durch Persephone als etwas über ihr Bereich des Wirkens Hinausgehendes erscheint, und dass zudem die Beschränkung dieser Körperlichkeit an ganz äusserliche Bedingungen etwas Gewalttames an sich hat. In der endgiltigen Ausführung ist beides verschwunden: Persephone entlässt den Schatten ohne Weiteres, eine Bedingung wird nicht mehr gestellt—was ist nun zur Erlangung der Körperlichkeit an die Stelle der früheren Auffassung getreten?

III.

Aber diese Körperlichkeit ist vielleicht doch nur ein Schein? Im Entwurf 1824 ("the plan of 1775" nach Gerber!) soll nach demselben Autor Helena eine "Halbwirklichkeit" genannt werden: richtig ist, dass nicht Helena allein, sondern sie samt ihrer ganzen Umgebung, also alles, was mit ihr von Troja zu kommen vermeint, bezeichnet wird als: "diese Halbwirklichkeiten." Damit ist betreffs der Natur der Helena, für Gerber wenigstens, die Sache sofort klar: "A semi-reality is not a mate-

rial reality of flesh and blood;" wer kann auch in das Rechenexempel Zweifel setzen: material reality minus flesh and blood = semi-reality? Wenn daher im Entwurf 1826 Helena als "wirklich lebend" bezeichnet wird, so heisst es zur Hebung dieses Widerspruchs: "She is to appear alive, or 'truly alive';" nun ist die Klarheit und Wahrheit hergestellt: Helena hat nur den Schein einer wirklichen Körperlichkeit zu erwecken—Goethe weiss zwar nichts davon, aber Gerber sagt es—da muss es ja wohl wahr sein. Minder gläubige Leute werden sich zunächst die willkürliche Einsetzung "She is to appear alive" für "truly alive" nicht bieten lassen, sondern sie nur als merkwürdigen Beleg für Gerbers wissenschaftliches Verfahren registrieren, im Übrigen aber sagen: entweder wir müssen zugeben, dass von 1824 bis 1826 eine Weiterentwicklung bei Goethes Plan stattgefunden hat: dann hat natürlich die spätere Auffassung Goethes zu gelten, zumal sie mit der Fertigstellung des Helenadramas zusammenfällt, und die "Halbwirklichkeit" wird überhaupt hinfällig; oder aber Gerbers Einsicht reicht nicht aus, um durch den scheinbaren Widerspruch den wirklichen Sachverhalt zu erkennen: das hat die grösste Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich, und so ist es in der That. Die Natur der Helena bei ihrem Wiedererscheinen stand für Goethe natürlich nicht erst seit 1824 und 1826, sondern schon seit 1800 fest und hat sich seitdem nie geändert: Helena ist das Ergebnis einer künstlichen Wiederbelebung, nicht das Ergebnis einer natürlichen Zeugung: insofern ist ihr Wesen das einer Halbwirklichkeit: eine Vollwirklichkeit kann nur einem solchen Wesen eignen, das seine Natur auf dem ihrem Wesen eigentümlichen Wege erhalten hat. Helena hat nun bei ihrer Wiederbelebung ihr Dasein nicht auf natürlichem Wege der Zeugung, sondern auf dem Wege eines Zaubers erhalten—also ist sie den natürlich erzeugten Wesen, hier besonders dem Faust, gegenüber eine "Halbwirklichkeit." Ist sie dies durch die Art ihrer Neubelebung, so ist sie doch infolge dieser Neubelebung in der That Sache ihres Daseins nicht etwa nur halbwirklich, so dass sie nur Schatten und nicht wirklicher Körper wäre; im Gegensatz zu ihrem bisherigen Schattendasein im Hades tritt sie jetzt auf der

Erde als "wirklich lebendig," d.h. als ein körperliches Wesen auf, wie es schon im Entwurf 1824 sehr klar und deutlich heisst: "durch einen magischen Ring ist ihr die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben." Zwischen der vollen Körperlichkeit der Helena, die notwendig ist, wenn sie auf der Erde verweilen und wenn Faust ihre Liebe auf menschlichem Wege gewinnen soll, und ihrer infolge ihrer künstlichen Neubelebung vorhandenen Halbwirklichkeit den natürlich erzeugten Wesen gegenüber ist also keinerlei Widerspruch: man muss nur imstande sein zu erkennen, dass, wo Goethe ihr zauberhaftes Dasein betonen will (Entwurf 1824:

"Nun muss man wissen, dass das Schloss mit einer Zaubergrenze umzogen ist, innerhalb welcher allein diese Halbwirklichkeiten gedeihen können"),

er dies mit dem treffenden Ausdruck "Halbwirklichkeit" thut, dass aber, wo die Realität ihrer Fleisch- und Blutkörperlichkeit hervorgehoben werden muss (Entwurf 1826, 17. Dez.: "um als wahrhaft lebendig aufzutreten;" 10. Juni: "wieder in die Wirklichkeit zu treten"), weil es hier auf ihre körperliche Verbindung mit Faust ankommt, diese Wirklichkeit zum Ausdruck kommt.

Durch die Verbindung der Körperlichkeit mit der Wirklichkeit, aus welcher sich der Zustand des "wahrhaft Lebendigen" bildet, steht die Wiederbelebung der Helena zu gunsten Fausts in bedeutsamem Gegensatz zu der Wiederbelebung Helenas zu gunsten des Achilles. Goethe wusste sehr wohl, dass Achilles auf der Insel Leuke sich befand, weil die Alten sich dort die Gefilde der Seligen dachten, wo die Heroen und die Heroinnen in Seligkeit lebten, nachdem sie aus dem Orkus dahin entlassen waren. Eine Rückkehr ins Leben mit diesem seligen Geiste ward nun Helenen als ebenso geistig geartetem Wesen vergönnt. Dort konnten sie beide als Geister sich verbinden. Als solchen kam ihnen die Wirklichkeit zu, aber nicht Körperlichkeit, die entweder durch natürliche Zeugung oder bei einer Rückkehr aus dem Hades in die Menschenwelt durch Zaubermittel erreicht werden muss. Wie Helena zu gunsten Fausts aus dem Hades entlassen wird, kann sie als geistiges Wesen sich mit dem Menschen Faust nicht verbinden,

es sei denn dass ihr zugleich die Körperlichkeit, das materieerfüllte Dasein verliehen wird. Zwischen beiden Entlassungen besteht somit eine "Ebenmässigkeit," soweit es sich um die Entlassung aus der Unterwelt handelt: hierfür kann die erste Entlassung eine Begründung für die Annahme einer zweiten Entlassung für den Dichter und für Persephone werden. Soweit es sich aber um die Art der Wiederbelebung handelt, ist zwischen beiden Entlassungen von Ebenmässigkeit nicht mehr die Rede: zu gunsten Fausts muss die neue Entlassung unter Bedingungen stattfinden, wie sie bei der ersten nicht obgewaltet hatten. Diese Bedingungen sind für Helena zur Gewinnung der hier notwendigen Körperlichkeit zuerst der magische Ring, dann der Aufenthalt innerhalb einer Zaubergrenze—denn die Körperlichkeit, die durch die natürliche Zeugung nicht zu gewinnen war, muss durch ein solches Zaubermittel erlangt werden. Goethe war sich dieses Gegensatzes sehr wohl bewusst. Nachdem er (Entwurf 1826) von der frühern Bedingung "ihres Wohnens und Bleibens" auf der Insel Leuke gesprochen hat, sagt er weiter:

"Nun [für Faust] soll sie ebenmässig [wie sie schon früher aus dem Hades entlassen worden war, aber diesmal unter die Menschen selbst, und zwar in ihre früheren Verhältnisse] auf den Boden von Sparta zurückkehren, um, als wahrhaft lebendig [d.h. nicht nur wirklich, wie es auch bei Achill der Fall war, sondern auch körperlich, wie es Faust brauchte], dort in einem vorgebildeten Hause des Menelas aufzutreten."

Gerber hat von diesen Unterschieden keine Ahnung: für ihn ist vielmehr die "analogy" des Wiederauftretens der Helena bei Faust mit dem bei Achilles der Grund zu schliessen, dass Helena hier keiner materiellen Verkörperlichung bedurft habe: nach Gerber ist die für Faust wiederbelebte Helena kein Wesen von Fleisch und Blut: sie mit ihren Gefährtinnen, alle sind ausschliesslich Geister und Gespenster, und der dritte Akt behält bei ihm ausschliesslich "the phantasmagorical character"—Goethe freilich erklärt, dass mit Fertigstellung der zwei ersten Akte dieser phantasmagorische Charakter, der nur so lang Sinn hat, wie Helena als besonderes Drama existierte, aufgehört hat—aber was geht Gerber an, was Goethe sagt? Die Sache liegt nach Goethe selbst

vielmehr so, dass im ganzen dritten Akte Helena mit den Ihrigen sich der künstlichen Vereinigung ihres Schattendaseins in der Unterwelt mit der körperlichen Materie auf der Oberwelt stets bewusst bleibt: sie alle müssen es sein, das sie sonst nicht diese Verbindung willkürlich lösen könnten, wie es bei all den aus der Unterwelt zauberhaft in die Oberwelt Zurückgekehrten wirklich der Reihe nach der Fall ist; eben deshalb ist diese besondere Art ihres Scheidens von der Oberwelt ein Beweis für die Art, wie ihre Wiederbelebung bei dem Übergang des Schatten aus dem Hades in die Oberwelt zustande gekommen ist. Mephistopheles hat besonders den Mädchen gegenüber im Gegensatz zu ihrer Freude an der Wiederverkörperlichung eine in der That teuflische Freude, ihnen ihr zauberhaftes Dasein stets aufs neue vorzuhalten; er hebt immer wieder hervor, dass sie tatsächlich in den Hades gehören, was die Lebenslustigen gar gerne zeitweilig vergessen möchten, und dass das Leben auf der Oberwelt ihnen in noch ganz anderem Sinne nur geliehen ist, als dies schon bei den natürlich Erzeugten der Fall ist. Helenen gegenüber benutzt dagegen Mephistopheles diesen Zustand, um durch dessen Hervorhebung sie für die Flucht vor Menelas und die Verbindung mit Faust gefügig zu machen.

IV.

Diese Verbindung des unterweltlichen Schattenlebens mit dem oberweltlichen materiell-körperlichen Leben, wodurch Helena, so wahrhaft lebendig sie auch ist, den echten Naturerzeugten gegenüber doch stets eine Halbwirklichkeit bleibt, ist der unabänderliche Charakter, den der Dichter nicht erst seit 1826, sondern seit 1800 für Helena festhält: die Art, wie sie zu dieser Verbindung kommt, gehört jedoch nicht zu den unabänderlichen Dingen. Auf welchem Wege diese künstliche Verbindung eintrat, welcher Zauber angewandt wurde, ja ob dieser Zauber von Mephistopheles oder von Persephone oder von anderer Seite her ausging—der Effekt war stets derselbe. So konnte Goethe auch ehe er sich über diese Art endgültig entschieden hatte, das Helenadrama nicht nur anfangen, sondern auch fertig dichten, da seine Grundvorausset-

zung in mindesten 26 Jahren stets unverändert blieb. Der Versuch jedoch, die Art der Verkörperung glaubhaft und dem Charakter der Gesamtdichtung entsprechend zu gestalten, gelang nicht ohne weiteres: je mehr die Gesamtdichtung sich ihrem Ende näherte, je klarer also der Grundzusammenhang nicht nur dem allgemeinen Vorsatze nach, sondern in der praktisch-künstlerischen Durchführung sich offenbarte, desto deutlicher mussten auch dem Dichter die Wege werden, die am sichersten die Antezedentien der Helena zu Ende zu führen im stande waren. Die Bewirkung des Zaubers durch Mephistopheles, die dem Dichter, sobald er die Heroine in echt antikem Charakter hatte auftreten lassen, sofort widerstand, diese "Synthese des Edlen mit dem Barbarischen," wie Schiller es nennt (an Goethe, 23. Sept. 1800: Pniower N. 183, S. 76), oder die Notwendigkeit, wie Goethe selbst sich ausdrückt, "Schönes mit dem Abgeschmackten durchs Erhabene," d.h. durch das Erhabene der Behandlung zu vermitteln (26 Sept. 1800, Tagebuch: Pniower N. 187, S. 76), hatte Goethe von der Fortführung der Helenadichtung zurückgeschreckt: diese erste und durch die Faustlegende nächstliegende Möglichkeit musste also fallen. An ihre Stelle trat die Einwirkung der Persephone, die zur Festhaltung des Schattens auf der Oberwelt in der That das Leben auf dieser notwendigen Verkörperlichung zuerst einen magischen Ring, sodann den Aufenthalt innerhalb einer "Zaubergrenze" als Mittel benutzte: dieser Weg liess sich schon eher mit der reinklassischen Existenz Helenas, wie sie im Helenadrama verwendet wird, dem inneren Wesen nach in Verbindung bringen: Mittel und Zweck bewegten sich ebenmässig auf dem Boden des Altertums. Sollte aber der Weg der Verkörperlichung vollständig glaubhaft werden, so musste er—und dies ist eine ganz neue Forderung, die erst bei der künstlerischen Durchführung in voller Kraft sich als notwendig erweisen konnte—dem Wege der natürlichen Erzeugung möglichst ähnlich werden: je mehr die beiden Wege—Erzeugung durch die Natur und Erzeugung durch den Zauber—übereinstimmten, desto glaubhafter und selbstverständlicher musste der Eindruck von der Wiederverkörperung der Helena werden. Diesen Weg aber

fand Goethe erst in der Zeit, in der seine ganze Dichtung den Charakter seiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse annahm. Es geschah dies natürlich nicht so, dass Goethe die Dichtung dazu missbraucht hätte, um naturwissenschaftliche Überzeugungen auszusprechen; so soll er es nach Gerbers kläglicher Anschauungsweise bei Homunkulus gethan haben, dessen Zweck sein soll "to embody one of his long-cherished scientific ideas" (Vol. xii, N. 6, S. 78); sondern so, dass Goethe, ganz anders als er es in früheren Zeiten gethan hatte, jetzt seine dichterischen Schöpfungen in möglichst genaue Übereinstimmung mit seinen wissenschaftlichen Überzeugungen brachte: ich habe dies Verhältnis genauer dargelegt in der Abhandlung "Die Wolken in Vision und Wissenschaft bei Goethe" (Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Litteratur und für Pädagogik von Dr. I. Ilberg und Dr. R. Richler: 1899, I Abt., S. 385-401), auf die ich daher hier verweisen kann.

So soll denn auch hier die Verkörperung der Helena und aller mit ihr aus Troja Gekommenen auf einem der wissenschaftlichen Überzeugung Goethes von dem Wesen der natürlichen Erzeugung möglichst entsprechenden Wege vor sich gehen. Das ist die letzte Phase in der historischen Entwicklung der Antezedentien der Helena: sie trat ein, als Goethe sich an die endliche Ausführung machte. Darüber dem Publikum etwas erläuternd mitzuteilen, lag nicht die geringste Veranlassung vor: 1824 und 1826 hatte Goethe solche Mitteilungen machen wollen und schliesslich auch sehr abgekürzt gemacht, weil er das Helenadrama, aus der Gesamtdichtung herausgerissen, allein veröffentlichte: da musste das Publikum einigermaßen Bescheid über die Voraussetzungen der Helenädichtung erhalten. Die künstlerisch endgiltig ausgeführten Antezedentien der Helena dagegen sollten dem Publikum erst im Zusammenhang der ganzen Dichtung bekannt werden; da konnte das Kunstwerk für sich selbst sprechen. Das ist der Standpunkt, den Goethe allen Anfragen gegenüber stets festgehalten hat. Dass dies aber das Kunstwerk vermöchte, davon war Goethe gerade in der Zeit überzeugt, als er das Helenadrama abgeschlossen hatte und

über die beste Gestaltung der Antezedentien nachzusinnen begann. Es geschah dies nach Pniower (N. 541, S. 197) etwa seit Mitte 1827. In jener Zeit schreibt er an Knebel über sein Helenadrama, was aber zugleich für seine ganze Faustdichtung galt: es habe zu einem Kunstwerk anwachsen müssen, "welches, ungeachtet seiner Einheit, dennoch schwer auf einmal zu übersehen ist." Aber

"die Hauptintention ist klar und das Ganze ist deutlich; auch das Einzelne wird es sein und werden, wenn man die Teile nicht an sich betrachten und erklären [wie es Gerber mit seiner Erklärung des Homunkulus thut], sondern in Beziehung auf das Ganze sich verdeutlichen mag" [wie ich bestrebt bin es zu thun] (14 November 1827: Pniower N. 585, S. 204).

Dabei ist Goethe

"überzeugt, dass wer das Ganze leicht ergreift und fasst, mitt liebevoller Geduld sich auch nach und nach das Einzelne zueignen werde" (An Iken, 23. September 1827: Pniower N. 563, S. 200).

Und wenn nun dieser stets aufs Ganze gerichtete, den Zusammenhang des Ganzen festhaltende Blick für etwas Einzelnes eine Beziehung, findet die bis dahin, noch kein anderer entdeckt hatte, so bedurfte es eines erleuchteten Denkers, wie es Gerber zu sein glaubt, um einen Grund für die Unrichtigkeit dieser Entdeckung in der Thatsache zu finden, "that no one before Valentin had ever thought of such a combination of Homunkulus and Helena." So sind auch, um Kleines an Grosse klar zu machen, nach Gerberscher Logik Kopsnikus, Kolumbus, Galilei, Newton, James Watt, usw. usw. selbstverständlich auf dem Holzwege gewesen, weil, "no one before" ihnen an die Dinge gedacht hat, die sie aufgestellt haben—diese "delphische Weisheit" ist allerdings von ganz besonders überwältigender Kraft der Überzeugung, zumal wenn man bedenkt, dass es auch damals nicht an Leuten fehlte, die die neue Erkenntnis als etwas ihre eignen Kreise Störendes empfanden und daher bekämpften, ohne freilich der neugefundenen Wahrheit den Weg bleibend versperren zu können.

VEIT VALENTIN.

Frankfurt am Main.

(TO BE CONCLUDED IN THE NEXT NUMBER.)

MILTON'S CONCEPTION OF THE
TEMPTATION AS PORTRAYED
IN PARADISE REGAINED.

MILTON'S second epic, it will be remembered, was an afterthought, the result of a suggestion from one of his friends: "What hast thou to say of *Paradise Regained*?" Then Milton turned from the old Hebrew legend that had furnished so admirable a framework for his more expanded mythology, to find in the Gospel accounts of the life of Jesus the material for his new poem. *Paradise* had been lost to mankind through the weakness of the first Adam in yielding to the wiles of Satan; it had been regained by the strength of the second Adam in resisting his wiles. Here was the *motif* for the new poem. And right to hand were the accounts by Matthew and Luke of the ignominious failure of Satan's three attempts upon Jesus. Expand these and you have your epic poem.

But there was a radical difference in the materials out of which Milton wrought his two epics. The story of Genesis is primitive man's first account of himself and the world; everything is objective and symbolic. According to Milton, Adam is a healthy boy lost in wonder at the revelations of his five senses. His Creator is himself writ large. The Son of God is a theological shadow thrown back, that possesses no personality, and need not square with anything historical. The Omnipotent is surrounded by angels near enough like Himself to be governed by the same psychological laws. Only one among these types seems to possess any real individuality, and that is Satan. Under these conditions Milton can give free rein to his imagination without much heed to the later development of mankind.

But in *Paradise Regained* Milton enters new territory. The Christian Gospels are not pre-historic folk-lore; they spring from an historical personality. And in making the Son of God of *Paradise Lost* the second Adam of *Paradise Regained*, Milton passes from the mythical and symbolic to the real and subjective. The second Adam, the theological Christ, is the historical Jesus; and incidents upon which the epic is based have come down to us as real personal experiences. This new

material would seem to demand a different treatment. Satan is no doubt the same as in *Paradise Lost*, and we should expect him to go about his business in much the same way. But the temptations which are to form the epic are a part of human psychology, and before they can be amplified they must be understood. If Milton does not understand them, but simply uses them as new material that may be worked in somehow with the old, then the second epic becomes merely a repetition of the first—we have the same Satan and the same impersonal Son of God, and the only difference is in the ending.

This, it seems to me, is the criticism of the Rev. Stopford Brooke in his little primer on Milton. He thinks the poem an attempt to do again what had been better done in *Paradise Lost*. "The error is not in the sameness of the subject, but in the treatment of the same subject a second time along the same line."

In developing the temptations Milton follows the order of Luke. Jesus is led by the Spirit into the wilderness; he fasts for forty days, at the end of which he is hungered. Then occurs the first temptation—that he turn the stone into bread. Milton paraphrases this in nineteen verses, after which Jesus and Satan converse to the end of the first book. Midway in the second book Satan returns and renews the temptation, this time with an elaborate banquet of his own contriving.

"The first temptation," says Mr. Brooke, "is treated so lightly that we see that Milton had no idea of its meaning. The conversation which follows, being founded on no clear view of the situation, is heavy and loses the solemnity of the hour."

He severely censures Satan's second attempt:

... "the truth is" Milton not having formed a clear idea of the temptation, tried to get one by repeating himself, and the Nemesis of unintelligent repetition fell upon him."

Milton's treatment of the second temptation meets with Mr. Brooke's approval. Satan offers Jesus the kingdoms of the world in fief, which Jesus indignantly rejects. Milton expands this temptation under four heads: the appeal to riches, glory, dominion, and wis-

dom—all as forms of earthly power. Says Mr. Brooke:

"Milton understands this, and his success in this part of the poem is owing to his clear conception of his subject. For when a poet possesses that, he works with unconscious rightness; when he does not, his work will be wrong in treatment, in ornament, in everything, and the more he attempts to finish it, the more wrong it will become."

In the third temptation Satan invites Jesus to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, assuring him of divine aid, but is repulsed as before. Milton paraphrases this briefly, and then describes the fall of Satan, who, "smitten with amazement," "fell whence he looked to see his victor fall." This description is expanded by allusions to Antæus and to the Sphinx, both of whom suffered a like misfortune. In this temptation, says Mr. Brooke, as in the first,

"Milton is driven into sensationalism because he did not understand his subject. The additions he makes to the story in the Gospel violate the meaning of the story. Even with the addition he could find no ideas on which his imagination could truly employ itself in this temptation, and he only glances over it."

As Mr. Brooke does not tell us what he conceives to be the true interpretation of the first and the third temptations, I have endeavored to discover his point of view, or at least to reach an interpretation that will explain Milton's alleged failure.

No event in Biblical history has led to more conflicting explanations, some of them over subtle, many of them childish, some even ludicrous. But we soon see that we can divide all commentators roughly into two classes:—

1. Those who take the temptation literally and from the objective point of view.
2. Those who interpret it symbolically and from the subjective point of view.

Those who hold the objective view regard Satan as a real, objective personality, whose actions need bear no relation to the previous mental condition of the one tempted. Mental processes begin only when the tempter appears, and the next temptation will depend upon the caprices of the tempter, not upon the mental state of the tempted. Those who hold

the subjective view regard the temptation as a real struggle in Jesus' own mind, of which the Scriptural narrative is a symbolical version as related in Eastern fashion by Jesus himself to his disciples.

The earliest commentators, of course, held to the literal and objective view. But the absurdities and inconsistencies of this explanation soon broke it down. As early as the time of Milton we find in the writings of the French theologian, Samuel Bochart, some question as to whether Jesus was led to the mountains by the devil, *re ipsa*, or only in imagination; and the discussions of a Dutch theologian of the same period (Spanheim) reveal the fact that the temptation was by some considered merely a vision. But in England the literal, objective view seems to have prevailed till about the middle of the eighteenth century, when John Mason, a dissenting divine, maintained in a sermon that the temptation was a trance, dream, or vision, in which the devil painted the scenes. But this diabolic-vision theory was no very radical change, for it still preserved the devil. "Whether Christ's being tempted by the devil passed in vision or not," said Bishop Warburton, "the reality of the agency is the same on either supposition."

The first thorough-going attack on the prevailing literalism was made by Hugh Farmer, a liberal divine, in 1761.¹ According to his theory the temptation was a

"divine vision with a wise and benevolent intention, as symbolical predictions and representations of the principal trials and difficulties attending Christ's public ministry." "The devil was not really and personally present with Christ, but only in mental representation, and consequently could act no part in this whole transaction."

From this view of Farmer's it is obviously but a step to the purely subjective treatment by modern theologians and historians, in which the devil is wholly eliminated as anything more than a symbol for the weakness of the flesh.

This brief sketch of the development of the several theories clearly indicates that Milton's conception of the temptation must have been the literal and objective interpretation of his

¹ *An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation.*

day. And to this view he was already predisposed, since he brought to the work the real Satan of his first epic. A comparison of his treatment of the temptations with the explanations given by commentators of the objective school shows that he practically agreed with them. In all objective explanations there is bound to occur a certain subjective element that is part of the Scripture narrative—despair, distrust, presumption. But always more important than this is the feeling that the real sin consisted in accepting a hint from Satan simply because he *was* Satan. Milton shows this feeling in his repetition of the first temptation. Satan asks,

"Tell me, if food were now before thee set,
Wouldst thou not eat?"

To which Jesus replies,

"Thereafter as I like
The giver."

If, therefore, Milton fails to understand the first and the third temptations, so do all who interpret the temptation objectively, and Mr. Brooke must belong to the subjective school.

According to the subjective explanation the form of the temptation is symbolic and represents a real struggle in Jesus' own mind. For, says Professor Sanday,²

"Only in the form of symbols was it possible to present to the men of that day a struggle so fought out in the deepest recesses of the soul."

The great difference between an objective and a subjective temptation as defined above becomes apparent. The subjective temptation, if the tempted one be at all rational, must possess a well defined unity, it must centre around some supreme desire or problem. Not so with the objective temptation. The wily Satan as a real, objective personality may seize upon one expedient after another with no apparent connection between them. This is well illustrated in Milton's two epics. In both Satan is the tempter, in both he is the real, objective personality, free to vary his means as suits his fancy; but there is a difference between the two poems, and that difference accounts for the success of the one and the failure of the other. In *Paradise Lost*, although Satan is free to choose his means,

² The Hastings Bible Dictionary, vol. ii, "Jesus Christ."

he is restricted to one definite object, to tempt our first parents to eat the apple, and all his efforts as directed toward that object must therefore possess unity. Not so with *Paradise Regained*. The subjective interpretation, the only one that could give unity to the temptation, not being understood by Milton, the various attempts of Satan are seemingly without connection, the transitions are lame, and the unity of the poem is lost.

But why did Milton understand the second temptation and develop it so well, while he failed with the first and the third? Let us consider the subjective explanation more closely. The instances related are regarded as representing actual mental experiences, things that were real problems to Jesus. Born at a time when Israel looked to the promised Messiah for deliverance from the Roman yoke, Jesus must naturally have shared the aspirations of his countrymen. The growing consciousness of some high mission, the assurances of the prophets, the dire need of his people, all forced upon him the question, Might not he be the promised Messiah? And the impetuous John stood ready to proclaim him, and the populace was eager to follow the deliverer who, coming on the clouds of Heaven, was to destroy his enemies by the breath of his nostrils. But Jesus must soon have found his nature at variance with this popular conception of the Messiah? In Isaiah, Zechariah, and the Psalms he found another Messiah, the lowly, loving Messiah of the poor, the humble, the wretched, more consistent with his conception of God as a God of Love. But to reject the rôle of the first Messiah meant to disappoint his dearest friends and begin a life that might end in persecution and death. Might he not therefore enact the two rôles; first inaugurate the new kingdom as the conquering Messiah, then continue it as the peaceful, loving Messiah? Therein lay the struggle, and in his perplexity he retired to the wilderness to fight it out alone. And the three temptations are all directly related to this struggle. The second is the central one: Shall he not deliver Israel from political oppression before he tries to free the individual from himself—his true mission? And the two other temptations are merely the means to

this end. Shall he prostitute his spiritual gifts to making bread of stones? Shall he leap from the temple and light unharmed among the astonished multitude, thus winning their adherence by a feat of magic—another prostitution of spiritual gifts? The result is decisive. He casts aside all thought of political reform—he will devote himself to his proper mission, the moral and spiritual elevation of the individual. To accomplish this he need not turn a stone into bread, or win the populace by the cheap magic of an aerial flight.

So closely, then, are the three temptations related, that to understand one is to understand all. If Milton did not understand the first and the last, he could not have rightly understood the second. But the second was so well suited to objective treatment that Milton could not fail to see its possibilities, and he made the most of them, working, as Mr. Brooke has well said, with "unconscious" rightness.

R. D. MILLER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORD "RÄZEL" IN GOETHE'S DICH-TUNG UND WAHRHEIT.

In the tenth book of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*,¹ Goethe tells us how he assumed the disguise of a young countryman in order to mystify the good people at the Sesenheim parsonage.

"So fand ich's lustig seine dichterischen Augenbrauen mit einem gebrannten Korkstöpsel mässig nachzuahmen und sie in der Mitte zusammenzuziehen, um mich bei meinem räthselhaften Vornehmen auch äusserlich zum *Räzel* zu bilden."

At first reading one is apt to look upon the form *Räzel* as merely an old-fashioned spelling for *Rätsel* = riddle. *Räzel* = *Rätsel*! "riddle" is common enough in the eighteenth century (Weigand, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* ii). In this sense the word has often been taken. Oxenford in his English version of Goethe's autobiography (London, 1848) translates "riddle," and Jacques Porchat (*Mémoires de Goethe*, Paris, 1862) translates "*une autre énigme*." German commentators, too, have sometimes

¹ Weimar edition, v. 27, p. 361.

taken the word in the sense of riddle. The older American editions of this part of Goethe's autobiography (those of Professor Hart and Professor Huss) write, respectively, *Räthsel* and *Rätsel*, and take it in the sense of riddle. At least, that must be inferred from the orthography and the absence of any comment.

But the word occurs also in the ninth book.² In characterizing his table-companion Meyer at Strassburg Goethe says:

"seiner ganzen Physiognomie gab es einen eigenen Ausdruck, dass er ein "*Räzel*" war, d. h. dass seine Augenbrauen über der Nase zusammenstiessen, welches bei einem schönen Gesicht immer einen angenehmen Ausdruck von Sinnlichkeit hervorbringt."

Here it is clear that *Räzel* has a meaning quite distinct from *Rätsel* = riddle. Loeper³ and Düntzer⁴ recognized that the word in book 10 must have the same meaning as here. They connect it with *Rad*, and in support of this etymology Loeper quotes the form *Rädselbrauen*. Professor von Jagemann in his edition of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* after giving the correct meaning of *Räzel* in book 10, adds: "the origin of this expression is obscure."

Heyne (D. W. viii, 197) does not know whether *Räzel* in the sense used by Goethe has any connection with *Rätsel* = riddle. However, he does not treat Goethe's *Räzel* as a separate word. This is what he says:

"rätsel, räzel, von einem menschen mit zusammengewachsenen augenbrauen."

After quoting the two passages from *Dichtung und Wahrheit* given above he continues:

"ob diese bedeutung mit der vorigen (that is: *rätsel* = riddle) zusammenhängt, erhellt nicht. in der Oberpfalz sind rätsel hausgeister, kobolde, die rätsellöcher bei Roding unterirdische gänge, wo die rätseln aus- und eingingen und hausarbeiten verrichteten."

Sanders also gives Goethe's *Räzel* under *Rätsel* = riddle. He quotes our two passages and several from other authors where the word refers to a person whose eyebrows meet, but offers no comment. Hoffmann⁵ gives "*Räzel*" under a special heading, making it masculine.

² Weimar edition, v. 27, p. 232.

³ Hempl'sche Ausgabe v. 21, p. 229.

⁴ Erläuterungen zu D. und W., 2nd part, p. 102.

⁵ *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1857, v. 4, p. 494.

It is a curious fact that lexicographers and Goethe commentators have in this case entirely overlooked the results of folklore investigations. The first to suggest the proper etymology of this word was Rochholz. In his fine collection of Swiss folklore (*Schweizer-sagen aus dem Aargau*, Aarau, 1856, v. i, p. 358) he states that in Alsace, Switzerland and Bavaria it was customary to apply the name *Rätzel* to people whose eyebrows meet. In this connection he refers to Goethe's use of the word in the ninth book of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. But the word *Rätzel* is also applied to dwarfs. Rochholz mentions *Rätzel-löcher* in the Bernese *Oberland* which the people look upon as the dwellings of dwarfs or goblins, also a *Rätzliberg* in the same vicinity. But these same *Rätzel* are also called *Schräzel*, which is the diminutive of *Schratz* (*Schrat*). There is other material to show that the names *Räzel* (*Rätzel*) and *Schräzel* (*Schrätzel*) are used to denote the same mysterious beings. Meier (*Schwäbische Sagen*, p. 171) relates that the incubus in some parts of Suabia is called *Schrettele* (diminutive of *Schrat*), in other places *Rettele*. Panzer⁶ tells of a cave which was the dwelling-place of the *rätzel*, a race of goblins. But we know that one of the most common names for goblins in Southern Germany is *Schräzel*.⁷ Panzer (*ibid.* i, 111) also supplied Heyne with the information about the *Rätzellöcher* at Roding and mentions in the same connection forms like *Schrätzenlöcher* and *Schrätzenlöcher*. In Alsace, too, we find the two forms used indiscriminately. The incubus is called *Schrätzmännel* in the valley of Münster; in Strassburg he is called *Letzel* or *Rätzel* (Stöber, *Sagen des Elsasses*, p. 279). In view of these facts it may be safely assumed that *Rätzel* and *Schrätzel* are identical.⁸

But why should a person with eyebrows that meet be called a *Räzel*? It is one of the most widely spread superstitions that a person who goes about at night tormenting people as an incubus may be recognized by eyebrows

⁶ *Beiträge zur deutschen Mythologie*, 1, 106.

⁷ Wuttke, *Deutscher Volksaberglaube*, §§ 45, 402; also *Schrätzel*, *Schrattelle*, cf. E. H. Meyer, *Germanische Mythologie*, pp. 76, 101, 124.

⁸ See also I. Peters, *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unter-richt* x, 512.

that meet above the nose. Witches, too, are said to have such eyebrows.⁹

Simrock (*Deutsche Mythologie*,³ p. 422) has given the results I have just stated. I can add one more testimony as to the identity of *Rätzel* and *Schrätzel*. Charles Schmitt in his *Wörterbuch der Strassburger Mundart* (Strassburg, 1896) p. 83, says:

Rätzel neutr. nach dem volksaberglauben ein schädliches, besonders die kleinen kinder plagendes gespenst. Wenn man eine gewisse sympathie anwandte, so 'Wenn's Kind am Morjes ufferwacht, het's Rätzel sich dervon gemacht.'

The word is clearly used in the sense of incubus, but the incubus, as we have seen, is frequently called *Schrätzel*. Cf. also Grimm, D. M.,⁴ Anh., p. 133. W. Hertz (*Deutsche Sagen in Elsass*, p. 212) says: "*Raz, Räzel ist ohne zweifel durch aphäresis aus Schratz, Schrätzel entstanden.*" He quotes from Schönwerth (*Aus der Oberpfalz* ii, 291): "*Razen, Razeln heissen im Südosten der Oberpfalz die Zwerge, neben Schrazen, Schrazeln.*" This corroborates what Panzer says about the use of the two forms in the Oberpfalz. Laistner (*Nebelsagen*, p. 337) mentions as a parallel development the MHG. forms *ratzen* and *schrätzen*, 'to scratch.'

Goethe's *Räzel* is, therefore, ultimately connected with *Schrat*, which is of doubtful etymology.¹⁰ As it is a diminutive form, it must be neuter and not, as Hoffmann states, masculine. Whether Goethe knew how the word came to have its peculiar meaning does not appear. From the passage in book 10 it would almost seem that he connected it with *Rätzel* — riddle.

JOHN A. WALZ.

Western Reserve University.

LEXICAL AND GLOSSOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

I.

THE following words on record in Salesbury's *Welsh-English Dictionary* (of 1547) seem to

⁹ Wuttke, §§ 213, 405; E. H. Meyer, p. 122; Witzschel *Thüringer Sagen* ii, 266.

¹⁰ Cf. Grimm, D. W. s. v. *Schrat*; Weinhold connects the word with *√ srt* to split (*Riesen des german, Mythos*, p. 268). The name may be applied to any demoniac being Golther, *Germanische Mythol.*, p. 126.

have escaped the vigilance of Dr. Murray and his able staff of co-workers, as they are absent from the *NED*: *agey*, *Anglyshlyke*, *barondum*, *behytten*, *blamed*, *cattalled*, *crobed*, *craftemanlyke*, *cuttayled*, *doughte*, *esquare*, *hawethornel*: *hædloc*, *Agey*, from *hædyl Age*; *Seisnigalidd*, *Anglyshlyke*; *barwneth*, *barondum*; *kachlyt*, *beshytten*; *keryddus*, *blamed*; *kattelus*, *cattalled*, from *kattel*, *cattel*; *krwm*, *crobed*; *crobed* may be a by-form of *crabbed*, *crooked*; Jones' *Dictionary* of 1688 has *crwm*. A *crump* or *hunchback*'d. Murray's first quotation for *crump* sb. 'hunchback' bears the date 1698; *krestwraidd*, *craftesmanlyke*; *kwlla*, *cuttayled*; a distinct by-form of *curtailed* 'bob-tailed.' *tæs*, *doughte*; cp. *WW*. 725, 21 *hoc fermentums urdowght*; *ibid*. 740, 10 *hec pasta doght*; similar formations are *bught* (*ibid*. 718, 1 *hic frons*, -*dis a gren bught*), *trowght* (*ibid*. 725, 13 *hic alvus*, a *trowght*), *margthe* (*ibid*. 678, 36 *hec medulla margthe*). *ycswario*, *esquare*; a by-form of 'to square'; *yspaddat* *hawethornel*.

Salesbury is also authority for a number of forms and spellings not noticed in the *NED*. Such are *awkwar* 'awkward,' *to aume* 'aim,' *a nauquayre* 'auger,' *broude henne* 'brood-hen,' *to chamme* 'champ,' *a coule* 'caul,' *a festue* for the usual *fescue*, *a nycke hole* 'hickwall,' *ysehatchelles* 'icicles,' *hyndmasse* 'hindmost':

chwithic, *aukwar*; *dysfaly*, *amkany aume*; cp. *amkan ayme*; *ebill*, *nauquayre*; *iar orillyd*, a *broude henne*; *knoi bwyd*, *chewe*, *chame*; *huc*, *A coule*; *sector i ddangos lythyrenneu*, a *festue*; *kasec y ddríkhin ederyn*, a *nycke hole*; *pibony*, *yse hatchelles*; *olaf*, *hyndmasse*.

Perhaps mention might also be made of the spellings *compenable* for 'companionable,' and *fedder sewe* for 'featherfew.' *cumpetnius*, *compenable*; *wermood wenn*, *fedder sewe*.

No notice is taken in the *NED* of *dally* as a noun 'jest,' nor is *exceptaj*. noticed in the sense of 'rare, exceptional.'

arabeddieith dalye, *jape*; *odid*, *excepte*.

As to quotations earlier than those adduced in the *NED*, Salesbury might have been drawn upon in a number of instances; so for *accused*, *archdeaconry*, *armful*, *arbitrate*, *assign*,¹ Cf. *trothe* in a *knedynge trothe*, *magis*, *pinsa*, *Cath. Angl.* 205b.

bennet, *bleak*, *bleakness*, *bow-knot*, *boiling-hot*, *camp* 'field,' *chained*, *cheese-rack*, *confessed*, *conscionable*, *countrylike*, *to courtesy*, *dispraised*, *entangled*, *exceeding of superior excellence*, *to ere*, *filled hospice*: *kuhuddedic*, *accused*; *archddiacondot*, *archdeaconrye*; *kofylaid*, *an armefull*; *kylafareddy*, *arbitrate*, *cōpounde*; *sein ne assein*, *assyne*; *kawnen*, *benet*; *gwineu*, *bleke*, *brown*; *gwineuder*, *bleknesse*; *kwlm dalen*, a *bowe knot*; *krychias ne verwedid*, *boyling hote*; *kamp mæs*, *campe*, a *felde*; *kadwynoc*, *chayned*; *karh caws*, *chese rake*; *kyffesol*, *confessed*; *kydwybodus*, *cōscionable*, *gwladaidd*, *cowntrelyke*; *kwrtelst*, *courtesy*, *angamoleid*, *dispraysed*; *rwystrys*, *entangled*; *odidoc*, *exceeding*; *eredic*, *plough*, *ere*; *lloneid*, *fylled*, *full*; *yspyty* *An hospyts*.

Some of the rarer words might also have been instanced from Salesbury, such as the following: *kam arfer*, *abusion*; *dyddhau*, *adawe*, *dawne*; *groneuthur marchoc*; *curddol*, *adubbe*; *kyreuddyl*, *areche*; *pwytlyl carey*, *an agglet*; *kessail*, *arme hole*; *amner*, *amner*; *ryddhau o effeirat*, *assoyle*; *awgrym*, *augrym*; *kryd kryny*, *axes*, *ague*; *synnedigaeth*, *astonysshednes*; *madrondot*, *astonysshednesse*, *ystlum*, a *backe*, 'a bat,' *kyfebyr val ewic*, *bagged* 'being with young'; *gwrthmnlloc*, *barbed*, (of a horse); *verth tec*, *bean*; *erchwyn*, *bedstocke*; *trawscwl*, *boystouse*; *bwsmant*, *bushe-ment*; *pigin gwisc*, a *byggen*; *bickre*, *bicker*; *glas val llw clais ar gnawd*, *blo*; *kydio o darw a bwch*; *bull* (of animals); *keispwl*, *catchepole*. I may be permitted to draw attention here to the fact that the OE *caecēpol* is absent from Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, though Kluge had pointed out the proper reading for the corrupt *hæcewol* (*exactor*) *WW*. III, 9, and Murray had availed himself of it for the *NED*. But then, the word is absent also from Hall's *Dictionary*.

Vn yn krogy geirieu, a *captious felowe*; *mursen*, a *calat*. As there is some doubt about the use of 'coy' in the sense of lascivious, I may mention here that Jones' *Dictionary* renders *mursen* by 'a coy dame'; *gobet*, *cobbe iron*; *kodpis*, a *codepece*; *ymoneuthur*, *confeder*; *rod-di yn siel*, *confyske*; *klwyfo march a hoyl yn y byw*, *cloye* 'prick a horse in shoeing'; *oerfel*, *coulthe*; *kostus*, *costyouse*; *teisto morwyn*, *de-noure* (read *defloure*) a *mayden*; *kerddet dan*

dwyllo, go darkelyng; *tremyg*, despyte, 'contempt'; *fossur*, a dycher; *dichell*, drift, policy; *llai llaw ar varch*, dunde; *hundy*, a dortoure; 'dormitory'; *ewythyr*, an uncle, eme; *egry*, to eygre; *elwtan*, ysyle 'hot ashes'; *kynnef*, er whyle; *yscymyn*, cursed, excommunicat; *siampler*, exemplar; *syppyn*, a fardell; *farsiron*, farsion; *filoc*, fyloke; *flair*, fvest, 'breaking wind'; *fleirio*, fvest; *newydd tanltiw*, fyre newe; *ascyrnygy dannedd*, fleere; *torchy llewys i vyny*, flype vp sleues; *poethder*, feruentnesse; *llawrtuy*, florthe of a house; *brath ac arf*, foyne 'thrust' brathy ac aryf, foyne; *from*, *sumesshe*; *gwreinyr*, an hāde worme; *kymeryd kyssur oes newyd*, take herte a gresse (printed gcesse); *kalondit*, hertlynesse.

As from Salesbury's *Dictionary*, so from other vocabularies, supplementary evidence might be gathered in addition to that printed in the *NED*. So under *glade* sb² 'opening' I see no mention of Levins *Manip. Vocab.* 8, 26 *a glade sinus*, us. For *slaught* (*flafte*) sb³ 'instrument used in preparing wool' the only evidence adduced is of 1875, Ure's *Dict. Arts.* li, 402, but Levins *Man. Voc.* 9, 29 *a flafte*, *carmen-tum* offers a far earlier instance. Under *flock-meal* there is no mention of *Man. Voc.* 207, 39 *flock-meale minutim* (read *minatim*, from *mina* drove) evidently) nor under *flack* 'to beat with flail' of *Man. Voc.* 54, 14 *to fleck*, *plectere* (printed is *flock flectere*, but as it appears among words in *ecke*, it is no doubt a mistake for *fleck plectere*). Under *hap* sb¹ there is lacking the quotation from Levins *Man. Voc.* 26, 47 *happe*, *fortuna*, ae; under *hap* v.¹ there is missing Levins *Man. Voc.* 27, 17 *to hap*, *chaunce*, *contingere*, nor does Levins *Man. Voc.* 27, 18 *to happe*, *couer*, *tegere*, *velare* appear under *hap* v.² or *ibid.* 28, 17 *hapte*, *tectus*, a, *uelatus*, a under *happed*. Under *fieldfare* we miss Levins *Man. Voc.* 28, 42 *a fildfare*, *turdus*, di, under *heskard*, *ibid.* 30, 25 *an haskard*, *proletarius*, *ignobilis*, under *dizzard* *ibid.* 32, 39 *a dysert*, *player*, *histrionis*, and 30, 15 *a disarde*, *pantomimus*, *sannio*, *hic*. Under *frail* sb.¹ 'kind of rush basket' we do not find *Prompt. Parv.* 175^b *frayle of frute palata*. Because of the (M Du.) form *vōre* under *furrow* sb. mention ought to have been made of *Prompt. Parv.* 171^a *fore or forowe of a londe sulcus*.

² o'r.

From the same vocabulary p. 170^b *forcelet*, *stronge place*, might have been quoted under *forcelet*¹, *ibid.* p. 169^b *fondyn*, or *a-sayyin* 'attempto under fand, fond, v.', *ibid.* p. 170^a *fonydng*, or *a-saynge attemptatio* under *fanding*, *fonding*. *Cath. Angl.* 178^b *an havyn-town baice*, fails to appear under *haven-town*. Under *brush* sb.² there is no mention of Levins *Man. Voc.* 193, 33 *a brushe verres*, is, *hæc*, nor of *ibid.* 193, 44 *to brushe verrere* under *brush* v.². Under *curd* vb. we miss *to cour* [d] as *milke coagulare*, *ri* *ibid.* 224, 18.

As to the etymology of *curse* (vb. and sb.) a valuable hint is given us in the dialectal *cursen*=*christen* when compared with *Cath. Angl.* 171^a, *halfe cursyd semipaganus* and Diefenbach's *catechumenus halber christen*. It is noteworthy that in the Irish Lives of Saints *exorcizatus* is equated with *catechumenus*, if I am not mistaken in supposing that the *exorcista*, appearing as cognomen of young S. Martin by the side of *catechumenus*, is meant for *exorcistsatus*=*exorcizatus*. *Cristnian* is in Beda as well as in the glosses the usual rendering of *catechizare*. So we read Beda (ed. Miller) p. 168, 1. *hine gecristnade* where the Latin text has *catechizatus*; *WW.* 372, 21 *catechizatus gecristnad*=507, 13. I expect to treat this interesting subject more fully at some later time. The OE. *draht*, required for draught sb. by Murray, I suggest, is supplied by the *draht*, on record as *droht*, *WW.* 486, 27 *tractibus drohtum*. In regard to the OE. quotation for *haw* sb., of c. 1000, *WW.* 138, 39, *gignalia hagan*, it should be noted that E. Zupitza, *Die German. Gutturale*, p. 104, following Kluge, compares with it MHG. *hagen*, 'Zuchtstier,' *hecken* 'to hatch,' OHG. *hegidruosa*, 'inguen': OSl. *kočani* 'penis.' Though Pogatscher approves of it, I believe we are justified in being slow to accept it. There is no evidence sustaining the supposition that *gignalia* is a derivative of *gign-o*, or that there ever was such a word in Latin as *gignale* 'procreating thing'. On the contrary, the word, occurring among names of trees, looks very much like a corruption of *quisquilia*, and in fact, we read *quisquilia hagan*, *WW.* 269, 5, in very much the same neighborhood in which *gignalia ha-*

³ This is an Aldhelm gloss as well as Corpus T, 311, *tractibus, nascum* (= *rascum*?)

gan appears. That *quisquilia* well fitted the idea commonly connected with the fruit of the hawthorn is evident. Among the cognates of *drite* v. quoted by Murray, there does not appear any from OHG. but we find *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 504, 2 *megio drizo* after *megitum quat* and *ibid.* 623, 5 we have *lasanus trizstuol*.

The OE. prototype required by Murray for *brook* vb. is, I think, extant in the *brōce* 'usus' we find *Beda*, p. 224 13 *oðþe in hwylchwugu satu geheowad waeren menniscas broces* (Ca: *bryces*). The Latin text has *vel in uasa quaelibet humani usus formarentur*.

No notice of the peculiar use of *hire* in Tussers's *Husbandry*, p. 62, is taken under *hire* sb., though the passage is quoted under *beath* vb: *And after at leasure let this be his hier (= curae ei sit), to beath them* (the wood for yokes, forks, etc.) and *trim them at home by the fier*. In regard to the OE. quotation for *hailstone* from *Ælfr. Hom.* i, 52 attention might have been drawn to the fact that *hagolstān* does not occur there in the usual sense of hailstone, but rather refers to cobblestones, picked up by the angry Jews to shower upon St. Stephen: *Durh þa soðan lufe wæs þes halga martyr swa gebyld þæt he bealdlice ðæra Iudeiscra ungeleaffulnysses ðreade and he ðrsorh betwux ðam greatum hagolstanum þurhwunode*. The OE. *crymman* presupposed by dial. *crim.* vb. is, I think, supplied by *gecrym(m)an* on record in *Leechd.* iii, 290 *nim of ðam gehalgedan hlase þe man halige on hlafmæsse dæg feower snæda 7 gecryme on þa feower hyrnas þæs berenes*; *ibid.* iii, 14, there is on record the OE. *fleotan* required for mod. *fleet* v²=to skim: *cnocie man þa ban mid æxes yre 7 seoðe 7 fleote þ smeru wyrce to trindan*, *ibid.* ii, 104 *fleot simle þ fām of*; *ibid.* ii, 96 *fleot of þ fām*. *Gecrymman* as well as *fleotan* are absent from Sweet's Dictionary.

German *Alaun* is according to Kluge not on record in OHG. but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 407, 66 *alumen alune i beize*. For *Ähren* the same authority presupposed an OHG. **grin*, but it is actually on record cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii 351, 34 *bunta (= bunia Steinmeyer) ern*, *ibid.* iii, 400, 63 *aniziz erin*.

For *Duft* Kluge quotes an OHG. *tuft* 'frost,' but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 350, 55 *cauma duft i estus* *Duft* undoubtedly signifies there 'hot breath.'

Buhle is according to Kluge on record in OHG. only as a proper name *Buolo*, but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 51, 1 *emulationes pulahti*. *Garstig* is 'weitergebildet aus spät mhd. garst 'ranzig'; dazu anord. Gerstr 'müssisch';' but cp. also *Ahd. Gl.* ii, 321, 10 *rancor gersti*; and (?) i, 782, 12 (in *exacerbatione*) *inderu grestti*. Does *Prompt. Parv.* p. 14 belong here? We read there *arestenesse or a-restenesse of flesshe rancor, rancitas*. The editor quotes from 'a MS. in possession of Sir Thom. Philip-pus' a recipe 'to sauen venesone of rastichipe' and in the Roll of A. D. 1381 'to do away restyng of venison, in the *Lib. Curæ Cocorum* (a. 1440) p. 33, *for to saue venysone fo restyng*. Cp. also *WW.* 662, 17 *caro rancida rest flesche*. For *Gicht* cp. OHG. *gegiht* (*paralysis*) *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 171, 34, for *Grat*, *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 354, 5, *spina rügbein i grat*. *Hebamme* appears according to Kluge usually as *hevianna* in OHG. but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 408, 56 *obstetrices heuammen*. Kluge does not record an OHG. form of *Kuan* 'namesake', but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 233, 7 *cognominalis ghanno*. As to *Knäuel*, cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iv, 187, 2 *globus i globellum spera filorum. i. clauel*. About *ledig* Kluge says that OHG. **lëdag lëdig* is not on record, but there is the verb *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 418, 64, *expediant lidigen*, *ibid.* iii, 418, 65 *expiaih gelideget*.

In regard to *lōten* cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iv 194, 22 *ferruminare quod est loden*. As to *Hag*, cp. *ibid.* iv, 194, 23 *indago circuitio regia in silua. s. hage*. Does the Northumbrian *hegū* (*siluis*), *Durh. Rit.* p. 118 belong here? I am rather inclined to think we have to do there with *hæg* 'cæsa' so that *hæg* (*silua*) would be on a par with *snād* (*silua*). Another similar expression for *silua* may be the *scaed* occurring in the *Corpusgloss* S. 173 *scara, scaed*. For we find in *Epinal-Erfurt* (C. G. L. v. 391, 25) *scara* explained by *arborum tensitas (= densitas)* and this is confirmed by the Bollandist explanation *scara, uirgultorum silua* in the ninth volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*. I will put here the passage to which it refers (p. 631^a). *Ego The-genbaldus, filius quondam Hrebaldi, tradidi partem hereditatis meæ Liudgero abbati in uilla quæ dicitur Fislacu iuxta ripam fluii Ruræ, id est illam Hovam integram, Alf-gating-houa cum pascuis et peruiis et aquarum decursibus et SCARA in silua, iuxta*

formam Houæ plenæ. *Scara* then means a coppice, and such would have to be the meaning to be attributed to *scæd*. *Scara* itself seems to be a Teutonic-Latin coinage; cp. OHG. *scara* 'section.' For the original meaning of *müde* cp. *Ahd. Gl.* ii, 539, 61 *anhelos muode* 'out of breath, panting.' *Lichten* is according to Kluge 'erst nhd.', being first on record a. 1652, but cp. *Ahd. Gl.* ii 548, 41 *leu-arat kelihta* and OE. *underlihtan* (*subleuare*) *Durh. Rit.* p. 51.

Among the sources of the glossary printed in Wright-Wülker, p. 192-247 (Harl. MS. 3376, Brit. Mus.), there must have been a *Hymnarium*, to judge by the following glosses: *WW.* 225, 25 *duodeno solio twelffealdum sette* seems to refer to the *hymnus De Sancto Mathia*, l. 1, *Matthia juste duodeno solio* (see *Anglo-Sax. Hymn.*, Surtees Soc. Public., vol. 33, p. 128)⁴. Undoubtedly to the *Hymnus S. Columbæ* '*Altus Prosator*' are to be referred the following glosses:

WW. 203, 5 *ceruleis turbinibus lageflodum podenum* = *Altus Prosator* l. 52 *maris caeli climatibus ceruleis turbinibus*; *WW.* 207, 26 *compagines i. coniunctiones iuncturæ gefeg* = *Altus Prosator* l. 113 *undique conglobantibus ad compagines ossibus*; *WW.* 221, 6 *debitis gedefum congruis* = *Altus Prosator* l. 115 *rursumque redeuntibus debitibus in mansionibus*; *WW.* 226, 29 *effectibus, i. operibus monitionibus uel dædum* = *Altus Pros.* l. 105 *reddemusque de omnibus rationem effectibus*; *WW.* 221, 16 *dealibus i. deificis godlicum* = *Altus Prosator* l. 68 *magni dei uirtutibus appenditur dialibus*; *WW.* 239, 17 *flammaticus ligen* = *Altus Prosator* l. 79 *ubi ardor flammaticus sitis famisque horridus*.

That *WW.* 208, 32 *congelauerat tosomne geraet* refers to *Passio Sanct. Apost. Petri et Pauli* 32, 18-16 (ed. Lipsius et Bonnet, p. 147), *sanguis uero ibidem congelauerat* and *geraet* is error for *geræc* has lately been made quite probable by Pogatscher. Perhaps to (*innuenit caput*) *berbicinum*, *ibid.* 32, 15, may be referred *WW.* 196, 35 *brugma barice* if that stands for

⁴ Cp. also *WW.* 217, 17 *cyclis rynnun* with *Ymnus in Epiphania Domini ad Vesperam* l. 13, *denis ter annorum ciclis* (*Anglo-Sax. Hymn.*, p. 48) *WW.* 217, 30 *declini i. proni, inclinati, humiliati uel aheldre* with *Ymnus ad Nocturnas*, l. 4 *cursu declini temporis* (*ibid.*, p. 36).

beruigina = *uernicinū barige*. The reading *baruigina* (*WW.* 357, 36), *braugina* *Corpus Glossary*, B 196, *baruina* *ibid.* B 55 can be explained from the *barbicinum*, extant in Codex U, and a confusion of *uernicinū* with *uerrinū* may have led to the interpretation *bārige*. *WW.* 241, 30 read *witecylle* for *hwit cylle*, (*folle bubulum i. uas piceum uel hwite cylle*); the Latin is shortened from *in culleum folle bubulum i. uas piceum* and refers to *Oros.* v. 16, 23 *damnatus parricidii insutusque in culleum in mare proiectus est*.

WW. 216, 17 *crustus cyrten* probably represents an original Latin *crustus ornatus*. The OE. interpretation *cyrten* is either based on *ornatus* being mistaken for the participle adjective or *cyrten* is truncated from *cyrtenesse*. The reference is undoubtedly to Aldh. *de Laud. uirginit.* cap. 58 (ed. Giles, p. 77): *ut crustu interdito phalerataque uenustate carnalis statura comatur*. The original *crustu* is on record in the *Erfurt*¹ (C. G. L. V. 353, 3 = *Corpus Glossary*, C 897) *crustu ornatu*. The Epinal's reading *crustu ornato* shows the same mistake on which the above *cyrten* is seemingly based.

WW. 225, 12 *dodrante [e] dreariende* (= *ed-ræsiendū*?) refers to *Hisperica Famina* cap. 15, *gemellum Neptunius collocat ritum fluctus, protinus spumaticam pollet in littora adsisam reflumque prisco plicat recessam utero, geminum solita flectit in orgium dissurrimina, afroniosa luteum uellicat mallina terminum, marginosas tranat pullulamina metas uastaque tumente DODRANTE inundat freta*. As to *dodrants* 'reflux' cp. *Revue Celtique* xi, 86 where *dodrantibus* is explained by *adsissis*, i. *adlauon*. *WW.* 216, 36 *curuanas scethas* refers to *ibid.*, cap. 18, *nitantes ceruicibus gestant curuanas*. *WW.* 204, 7 *cephalus g heafodpaune* refers to the following line of the *Lorica*: *gigram cepphale cum iaris et conis*. To *conis* of this passage (read *coris*) is also to be referred the *conas ougan*, *Ahd. Gl.* iii. 430, 27. *WW.* 193, 7 *bathma i. femora peoh* refers to the line of *Lorica*, reading *batma exugiam atque binas idumas*, to which also *Ahd. Gl.* iii. 431, 37 *bathma thioch* refers. Here belongs also *WW.* 243, 33 *exugia, i. minctura micgerne*. *WW.* 201, 9 *catacrinas hyppan* refers to the line *catacrinas, nates cum femoribus*, and there cannot be any doubt that *Corpus Glossary* C 250, *catagrinas*,

bleremina mees belongs here, too, though the interpretation is apparently corrupt, at any rate unintelligible. To the line *patam linganam sennas atque michanas (mysteras, Cock.)*, I would refer the *liganā* (reading of *b*) *zunga*, *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 430, 36 and Erfurt (C. G. L. ii, 588, 52) *pata frons*. To *cladam, crassum* (read *capsum*), *madianum, talias*, I believe refers the *sasan* appearing *WW.* 200, 36 after *casses retia uel*. Pogatscher would make *cassan* the plural of *casse*, an alleged Anglicized *cassis*, but *WW.* 365, 15 *cassan beost* (read *capsum breost*) shows plainly that two glosses have been run together, viz. *casses retia uel . . . capsum . . .*

To the same line refers *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 431, 3 *taliastenden* to *pupillis, rotis, palpebris, tautonibus* refers *Ahd. Gl.* iii 430, 20 *tautonibus* *ouer . . . To *capitali centro, cartilagini* refer *WW.* 202, 43, *ceruellum i. centrum* (read *centrum. i. cerebellum*) *brægen*. *Centrum* seems to be a Celtic coinage from Irish *cen* 'head' denoting 'that which is in the head;' cf. O. Ir. *inchin* 'brains.' To the line *marsim, reniculos, fethrem cum obligia* is to be referred *WW.* 239, 14 *filher snædelþearm* and the *Epinal-Erfurt* (C. G. L. v. 376, 3) *obligia nettae (nectae) = Corpus O* 147. To the line *tege tolian thoracum cum pulmone* refer *Ahd. Gl.* iii 431, 6 *torax grecum hoc est brustlappa* and *WW.* 203 11 [*thorax i.*] *centumcilio. i. pellis feleferð uel centumpellis*. The interpretation *feleferð* which is identical with the *felo fearth* (*Epinal*), *felufreth* (*Erfurt*), *feolufreth* (*Corpus*) glossing *torax* (C. G. L. v. 397, 4) renders it probable that *WW.* 203, 11 *centumcilio* is not the original lemma, but rather *thorax*, and that the glosses quoted are related. For the meaning of *feleferð* cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii 321, 82 *omasus filefart* (read *filefalt* with Steinmeyer) and *WW.* 610, 38 *scruta exta. i. tripe, the felvelde* Mr. Sweet makes of it a bird, the fieldfare! Of the glosses taken from the *Hisperica Famina* and the *Lorica*, I expect to say more at some later time. I will conclude with drawing attention to a very ludicrous 'ghostword'

⁵ Cp. *Ahd. Gl.* iii, 638, 5 *torax brunie ? cassida* with which latter Steinmeyer brings together Italian *casso* 'breast,' as he does *cassa spunerunst* *ibid.* iii 496, 42. Cf. also in the Luxembourg Folio, p. 1, no 54, *crasici (= cassici = capsici) pectoralis. Revue Celtique* i, 348.

⁶ Cp. also *Erfurt* (C. G. L. v. 393, 31) *tautone palpebrae = Epinal (tautonæ) = Corpus T* 34 (*tautonæ*).

Sweet has taken over from Hall, though the latter gives his source, and that might have enabled the learned veteran to correct the evident error. Hall prints *puerisc* 'boyish' *WW.* 528, 30 (Lat.) The gloss appears among those taken from Aldh. *de Laud. Virginum* and it would have been easy to find in Giles' edition, p. 182, the passage referred to, *Musica Pierio resonant et carmina cantu* and to see that *puerisc* is a slight mistake for *puerisc* 'Pierian.' There are many other errors Sweet has accepted on Hall's authority, but of that later.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford, Conn.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Don Quixote de la Mancha. Primera Edición del texto restituido. Con Notas y una Introducción por JAIME FITZMAURICE-KELLY y JUAN ORMSBY. 2 vols. Edimburgo: Constable; Londres: 1898, 1899. David Nutt, Editor. 4,° lx, 510 pp. and xiii, 556 pp.

La Celestina por Fernando de Rojas, conforme á la Edición de Valencia de 1514, Con una Introducción del Dr. D. M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO. 2 vols. Vigo Librería de Eugenio Krapf, 1899, 1900. 8vo, lvi, 237 pp. and pp. 238-470, with a bibliography.

AT last a truly critical edition of the Cervantes' immortal work has appeared, and is published with a magnificence of which its author—struggling all his life with most persistent poverty—certainly never even dreamed. And yet, after waiting nearly three hundred years, it was reserved for two English scholars to bring out a definitive edition and to publish it in Scotland. Grateful as every Spaniard must be for this truly magnificent and scholarly work, he cannot help but feel a twinge of regret that the great masterpiece of the Castilian tongue should have found no one in the land of its birth who could or would competently edit it. The glory of Spanish literature has received its final form at the hands of strangers.

This edition is truly a monumental one, for in addition to the thorough scholarship with which the text has been handled, it is also one of the most beautiful specimens of printing

that I have ever seen. The editors, Mr. John Ormsby and Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly are two of the most distinguished Spanish scholars in England. Mr. Ormsby¹ has made the best English translation of *Don Quixote* that has yet appeared, and is also known by his spirited translation of the *Poema del Cid* and various essays on Spanish literature, while Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly is the author of an excellent life of Cervantes and of a Manual of Spanish Literature² that is incomparably the best that has yet appeared. It would be hard indeed to find two more competent *Cervantistas*, and the high regard in which these scholars are held in the literary world is entirely justified by the edition of *Don Quixote* which they have produced. The Introduction of the editors (written in Spanish), which is a history of the text and a justification of their treatment of it, is most clear and convincing. They say:

"In this edition of *Don Quixote* we have tried to present the text freed from arbitrary alterations introduced by our predecessors."

They show that there were five editions of *Don Quixote* published in 1605.³ The printing of the *editio princeps* was finished on Dec. 1, 1604, and must have been offered for sale at the beginning of 1605. It was a very poorly printed book, for Cervantes not having sufficient means to publish the work at his own expense, had sold his author's rights to Francisco de Robles, printer to the King, and Robles sent the manuscript to the press of Juan de la Cuesta.

Doubtful of the success of the book, Robles spent as little as possible upon it. The manuscript had, moreover, passed through many hands before it reached those of Cuesta. Two months before its impression Lope de Vega spoke of it to the Duke of Sesa as of a book which both knew well, and as Lope spoke disparagingly of it, it did not strengthen the hope of the printer in its success. Nevertheless, the

book met with immediate favour, and Robles, who had at first only obtained a *privilegio* for Castile, was not long in obtaining one for Aragon and Portugal, and brought out another edition (the *privilegio* dated Feb. 9, 1605), which was followed by two fraudulent editions in Lisbon—one by Jorge Rodriguez, with a license dated Feb. 26, 1605, and one by Pedro Crasbeek, (licensed Mar. 27, 1605); and, finally, another edition appeared at Valencia by Pedro Patricio Mey, with an *aprobación* dated July 18, 1605. This shows clearly how eagerly the work was received.

It will be seen that only three months elapsed between the first and second editions issued by Robles, and the hurry with which this second Madrid edition was gotten out may be seen in the two striking errors on the very title-page, although some of the oversights and errors of the first edition are here corrected. Still, Cervantes, as the editors say, had no part whatever in this matter, for he was living at Valladolid, three or four days journey from Madrid, and lack of time did not admit of the proofs passing from one city to another. Besides, at that time, after an author had sold his rights to the printer or editor, he had no control whatever over his work, or any right to intervene for the purpose of amending or correcting it.

As Lope says in the "Prologue to the Reader" in *Parte xvii* of his *Comedias* "*una vez pagados los ingenios del trabajo de sus estudios, no tenían acción sobre ellas.*" The complaints made by contemporary writers show the frequent abuse of editorial power, and the corrections or rather changes made in the second edition of *Don Quixote* prove that these complaints did not lack foundation. The editor gives a number of examples of these changes, due chiefly to the stupidity of the editor:—the *murassen y tapiassen* in Chap. vii changed to *mudassen*; in Chap. xxiii *los siete macabeos* changed to *los siete Mancebos*, and a number of others, all of much importance for a comprehension of the text.

Bowle, as early as 1777, knew of these two Madrid editions of 1605, a fact that was unknown to the Spanish Academy when it published its edition three years later, taking the second edition for the first, and believing it to

¹ Mr. Ormsby died, as we learn from the Introduction, when only twenty-five chapters of Part I had been edited.

² We are promised both a French and a Spanish translation of this work. Let us hope it may not be long delayed.

³ There was probably also an edition published at Barcelona in 1605, as Cervantes speaks of it, and it was the habit of the Barcelonense, Sebastian de Cormellas to reprint every good work the same year that it appeared.

be the only one published by Robles in that year. Pellicer did the same thing and was followed by Clemencin. The Spanish Academy did not recognize its error till the appearance of its fourth edition in 1819. It seems that Hartzenbusch, in 1863, first observed the important textual differences between the two first editions. Concerning the edition of 1608, which has by some been held to have been corrected by the hand of Cervantes, the editors note that it was Pellicer who first ascribed especial authority to this edition.

"He presumed that when the Court was moved from Valladolid to Madrid in 1606, that Cervantes also migrated thither, and he says ingenuously that two years later Cervantes determined to reprint his *Ingenioso Hidalgo*, a matter that was as much beyond his power as were the conditions of peace in the Netherlands."

There is not a bit of evidence to prove that Cervantes was living at Madrid in 1608, and "no one has yet been bold enough to assert that Cervantes corrected the proofs being absent from Madrid." Moreover, as we have seen, Cervantes, having parted with his rights to Robles for the period of ten years, he had no authority whatever to prepare a new edition. In fact the editors subsequently show clearly that Cervantes was not resident or present in Madrid in 1608, although he resided there from 1609 until his death. The alleged authority of this edition therefore falls. It is also shown that it is very likely that Cervantes never saw any other edition except the first, and that the only text, therefore, that possesses authority is the *editio princeps*.

"This, like the others, did not have the advantage of having been printed under the care of the author, and it may be that the copyist and the printer made mistakes now and then. But for this there is no remedy. What can be remedied is the injustice that has been done to Cervantes by attributing to him absurdities that he never wrote, nor which he ever could have written, and that have brought upon him the reputation of writing an obscure and careless style."

So much for the first part of *Don Quixote*. Concerning the second part, the state of affairs is quite different. There can be no dispute here upon the authority of the text.

"Cervantes likewise transferred his rights to Robles, who published an edition, and no

other appeared during the lifetime of the author, nor does anyone pretend that there existed a posthumous edition corrected by the author in his last days."

The editors call attention to the more favourable conditions under which this second part was written. Cervantes was no longer an unknown author struggling with poverty; "the vagabond of former years, without a roof and without credit." The success of the first part of *Don Quixote* had made him famous; his name had been carried beyond the Pyrenees, and "gave him importance in the eyes of the Madrid booksellers." Cervantes wrote this part deliberately; here, as the editors say, "his style is truly his, clear and without the circumlocution and the laboured latinized phrase of the school then in fashion." Besides, Cervantes was residing in Madrid, and could be consulted by Robles, "though there is no reason for supposing that author and editor demanded a pedantic exactitude of text."

The principles that have guided the editors in the construction of the text is contained in the statement that

"the only sure road to follow is to admit no emendation whatever, however ingenious it may be, when a reasonable presumption exists that the author wrote the word or words that appear in the primitive text."

This principle has been strictly adhered to, though the lawless orthography of the first edition has been corrected, the punctuation has been revised, the text re-distributed in paragraphs, and the dialogue has been so arranged that the different parts are readily discernable.

It is safe to say that the edition of Mr. Ormsby and Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, based upon the *editio princeps* and printed with the utmost care and exactitude, is the definitive edition of *Don Quixote*, from which all future editions must take their text. The editors have conferred an enduring favour upon all students of Spanish literature, for which they should feel deeply grateful.

After *Don Quixote* there can be scarcely a doubt that the next greatest work in Spanish literature is the *Celestina*, though perhaps it is to be feared that this is a work more talked

and written about than read. Menéndez y Pelayo, the editor of the edition before us, and the most learned of Spanish critics, says:

"In our opinion the *Celestina* is one of the most genial and extraordinary works that the literature of any nation can show, and the work which, perhaps, amongst those produced upon our soil, merits the second place after the *Ingenioso Hidalgo*."

Of course without direct access to the earliest impressions a critical and final edition of the *Celestina* is impossible, but it is certainly a strange coincidence that this first attempt at improving the text and furnishing the variants of other editions, should appear in the same year with the *Don Quixote* mentioned above. Though the editor is the first of Spanish critics, the printer is a German, like so many early printers of Spain, and like many of them, he has produced a book which, typographically, and in everything that goes to make a book beautiful, is a work of surpassing excellence.

And it does not issue from the press of Madrid, with its Ginestas, Fortanets and Aribaus, but from the small Galician town of Vigo—a place quite unknown in the annals of Spanish printing. The text here given is based upon the edition of Valencia, 1514, which is supposed to be a reproduction of the lost Salamanca edition of 1500. How closely this text represents the text of 1500, of course we do not know.⁴ It is preceded by a critical study of the *Celestina* by Don. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, now the director of the National Library at Madrid. It is, in the main, the same luminous and searching study with which we are already acquainted, but it appears here newly corrected and augmented, a model of clear and beautiful style which other Spanish critics would do well to imitate.

In his discussion of the authorship of the *Celestina*, Menéndez y Pelayo rejects entirely the theory that the first Act was written by either Juan de Mena or Rodrigo Cota. The pedantic prose of the former, full of inversions and latinisms, shows that it is utterly impossible that he should have written the *Celestina*. Concerning Rodrigo Cota, the

author of the beautiful *Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo*, we unfortunately have no prose that he has written, and the editor's argument is not so convincing. In his opinion Fernando de Rojas is

"the sole author and creator of *La Celestina*, which he composed, not in a fortnight, but in many days, months and even years, in all conscience, tranquility and repose, never wearying of correcting and filing it, as the numerous variants of all the editions which we can suppose to have been made during his life prove,—variants which concern the first Act as well as the remaining ones."

And again the editor remarks:

"The identity of style in all the parts of the *Celestina*—the serious as well as the humorous ones—is such that in spite of the respectable opinion of Juan de Valdés to the contrary, it has been repeatedly pointed out by critics."

Menéndez, however, finds a deeper reason—one which in his opinion utterly precludes the possibility of the first Act having flowed from a different pen from that which wrote the succeeding ones, and that is the admirable unity of thought that pervades the whole work; the constancy and fixedness in the delineation of the characters; the logical and gradual development of the story, and the complete mastery with which Rojas controls his material;—not like one who continues the work of another, but like one who disposes freely of his own work. Finally, summing up, he says:

"We believe then that the *Celestina* is the work of a single author who can be no other than the batchelor Fernando de Rojas, a native of La Puebla de Montalbán, Alcalde Mayor of Salamanca, and finally an inhabitant of Talavera de la Reina."

In discussing the origin of the *Celestina*, Menéndez y Pelayo states that its true prototype is to be sought in an unrepresentable Latin comedy of the twelfth century, the *Pamphilus de Amore*, freely imitated in Castilian verse by the Archpriest of Hita.

"It is the *Trota-conventos* of the Archpriest which is the true ancestor of the *Celestina*, and to no one of his predecessors did Fernando de Rojas owe so much as to the Archpriest of Hita."

For the dialogue, however, he was in all probability indebted to the *Corbacho* of another Archpriest—Alfonso Martínez of Toledo, Arch-

⁴ See now, for the bibliography of the *Celestina* the articles of Foulché-Delbosc in the *Revue Hispanique*, vol. vii, which has appeared since the above was written.

priest of Talavera, who composed his satire in the time of John II. (1438).

So far as the authorship of the *Celestina* is concerned, however, we may say that more than forty years ago,⁵ Ferdinand Wolf had arrived at the same conclusion as Menéndez, and Wolf likewise makes the comparison with the *Corbacho* of Alfonso Martínez de Toledo.⁶

The authorship being definitely settled we come to the question of the bibliography of the *Celestina*, and there is nothing but doubt and uncertainty so far as the first edition is concerned. When was the *Celestina* first printed? At Burgos in 1499 by Fadrique Aleman of Basle? Or is the edition of Salamanca, 1500, now lost, the first one?

Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, than whom there is no better authority on this point, and whose aid has been invoked by the publisher, Señor Krapf, in the compilation of the Bibliography contained in Vol. ii, speaks very guardedly concerning this 1499 edition. In his Introduction to Mabbe's translation of the *Celestina* he says "if that be the true date," and later in his *History of Spanish Literature*, using the words "as it seems"—in both cases leaving room for plenty of doubt.

The copy described by Brunet is the Heber copy, which passed into the possession of M. de Soleinne, and then found its way into the library of Baron Seillière and when, after the latter's death, his books were sold, in 1890 it passed into the hands of Mr. Quaritch. See the *Catalogue de livres rares et précieux*, etc., composant la Bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron Ach. S. . . . Paris, 1890, No. 584, in which we find the statement: "*Salvá, donnant dans son Catalogue la description de notre exem-*

⁵ Zur Geschichte der Spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur, Berlin, 1899, p. 297.

⁶ Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in his introduction to Mabbe's translation of the *Celestina*, London, 1894, had expressed himself as follows:

"But if Rojas did not read it (Pamphilus, De Amore) he may have found the germ of his story in the *Libro de Cantares* of Juan Ruiz, who names his sources with characteristic candor: *io feo del estoria dis Piv filo e Nas.n*: indeed the *Trota-conventos* of the Archpriest of Hita, mentioned by Parmeno in the second Act, is as surely the rough sketch of the Bawd as Don Melón de la Uerta and Doña Endrina de Calatayud are anticipations of the lovers. And from the *Corbacho* of a second learned cleric, Alfonso Martínez de Talavera, Rojas not only lifted some passages bodily, but further, conveyed the usage of popular proverbs and catch-words, which he developed with a will and a profusion unsurpassed by Cervantes himself." P. xiii.

plaire, déclare que c'est la suele qu'il con-
*naisse."*⁷

There seems, therefore, to be but one copy of this edition known, the original Heber copy, lately in the possession of Mr. Quaritch. Upon the last page of this copy is the legend: NIHIL SINE CAUSA. 1499. F. A. de Basilea, with the wood-cut mark of this well-known printer, also a German. Now this last page, Brunet says, has upon it the water mark "1795." It is on this account that the whole book has been considered by some to be a forgery. But, why may not this last page merely have been supplied in fac-simile, and the text still be genuine? Another copy *may* have existed at the close of the last century or at the beginning of our own. There is nothing so unreasonable about this. Books very easily disappear, and even manuscripts—generally much more closely guarded, also vanish. Mr. Libri, we all know, caused many of them to do so, and at least one very important manuscript disappeared a few years ago from the very vigilant guardianship of the custodians of the British Museum. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, writing to me some time ago, expressed himself as follows:

"Not having seen the 1499 ed. I cannot bluntly call it a forgery. The forged date is suspicious, but that might be forged and the *text* might belong to 1499, the leaf being inserted to make good a defect, etc. But the fact of the forgery does not stand alone. There are other facts: that a 1499 *Celestina* is never heard of till 1837; that Quaritch would let nobody see it; that now, having sold it—as he alleges—he refuses to disclose the purchaser's name. None of these circumstances is conclusive, if taken alone; taken together they tell against the authenticity of the book. But I cannot positively say it is absolutely unauthentic till I have seen it; nor, so far as I can see, can anybody else."

There are, however, a number of presumptions in favour of the authenticity of the Burgos ed. of 1499, or at least in favour of an earlier edition than that of Salamanca, 1500. Fadrique Aleman, the printer of the first edition of the *Chronicle of the Cid*, was a well known publish-

⁷ There was a sale of some of Baron Seillière's books in London in 1887, but after tracing a number of other extremely rare books which Quaritch says he purchased at the Seillière sale in Paris in 1890, there can be little doubt that the above catalogue is composed entirely of books that once formed part of the Seillière collection.

er in Burgos at that time. The 1499 text contains but sixteen Acts—which follow each other logically—and seventeen wood-cuts; the lost edition of Salamanca, 1500, as deduced from the editions of Valencia, 1514 and 1518, already contained the whole twenty-one Acts, and probably also had the twenty-two wood-cuts that all copies of the complete work seem to have contained down to the Venice edition of 1534. There can be scarcely a doubt in the mind of any one who reads the work carefully that the edition of sixteen Acts is the older rescension, and that the additional five Acts, which first appear in the Salamanca edition of 1500, have been merely interpolated between Acts 14 and 15 of the original. All the editions from 1502 to 1534 followed the 1502 Seville edition, as the omission of the stanzas "*Penados Amantes*" show. The edition of 1501 was not followed.

All these editions except the *princeps* contain twenty-one Acts. But lately two editions have come to light which follow the 1499 Burgos edition, and contain only sixteen Acts. M. Foulché-Delbosc discovered one (Seville, 1501), in the Bibliothèque National, at Paris, and has just reprinted it.⁸ In addition to this the Marqués de Jerez de los Caballeros has lately come across an edition, also in sixteen Acts, printed at Seville, 1502. These discoveries, naturally, suggest anew a whole series of questions that cannot be answered till we have the texts before us: ex. gr. are the five acts interpolated between Acts 14 and 15 unauthorized? Are they the work of Alonso de Proaza? And a number of others immediately arise, equally difficult to answer.

In the meantime, I confess, that personally, I am inclined to believe in the genuineness of the edition of Burgos, 1499, until better proof of its falsity is adduced. Of course, nothing can be said with any certainty till these three copies in sixteen Acts are carefully scrutinized and compared.

The Bibliography which Señor Krapf has compiled, is an excellent one, and also contains a review of the principal translations of the *Celestina*, the whole done with great care. The second volume concludes with the Latin

⁸ I have not seen this edition, but as has been observed above, the whole aspect of the bibliography of the *Celestina* has been considerably changed by the investigations of M. Foulché-Delbosc.

text of the *Pamphilus de Amore* and an *Advertencia* by Menéndez y Pelayo.

In conclusion I may say that Señor Krapf has done excellent service to the cause of Spanish literature by giving to students at once the best and by far the handsomest edition of the *Celestina* that has yet appeared. To read, for example, the 1599 Plantiniana, and then turn to this Vigo edition, we can appreciate the boon the publisher has conferred upon us.

Let us hope that students of Spanish literature will now avail themselves of this beautiful edition of the *Celestina*, and that it may find the wide circle of readers that it so well deserves.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Ioannes Nicolai Secundus: Basia. Mit einer Auswahl aus den Vorbildern und Nachahmern herausgegeben von GEORG ELLINGER. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1899. 12mo, lii+38. (Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben von Max Hermann. 14.)

BASIA, the cycle of poems which Joannes Nicolai Secundus wrote on the ever interesting subject of kisses, has found a new and very able editor Mr. Georg Ellinger.

Contrary to the principles established for the *Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler*, the text follows B, the edition of 1541, as the *editio princeps*, a print of 1539, was made from an incomplete and careless copy of the poems. The text of the reprint agrees, therefore, was Bosscha's edition of Secundus' works, except in a few passages stated on page xlvii.

Mr. Ellinger has greatly enhanced the value of his work by adding a selection of the Neo-Latin models and imitations of the Dutch poet, and by offering much information about the history of *Basia*.

The first chapter of the introduction treats of the models for the cycle. These are found not only in certain poems of the Greek Anthology and in two poems of Catullus, but also in the poetry of the Humanists. And it is the merit of the editor to have pointed out for the

first time the two most important sources of inspiration for Secundus, namely the *Osculum Panthiae* of Philippus Beroaldus and Petrus Crinitus' poem *Ad Neæram*.

By far the most interesting chapter is the second, which has for its subject the influence of Secundus' graceful poems upon Neo-Latin as well as national literatures. As we trace this influence in the Netherlands, France, Italy, England and Germany, we are impressed with the number of great names among the imitators, translators, or admirers of Secundus; by the side of Ronsard and other poets of the Pleiad we find Philippe Desportes and later Mirabeau, and with Weckherlin, Opitz and Fleming stand Günther, Bürger and Goethe.

Regarding the relation of *Basia* to German literature, the editor combats the view, generally accepted, that Secundus affected very strongly the lyric poetry of Germany during the seventeenth century. The fact is brought out that in the first half of that century a direct influence of the Dutch poet can be proved only in a few cases, and it was not until the latter half of the eighteenth century that German poets—among them Bürger and Goethe—again drew inspiration from *Basia*.

MAX F. BLAU.

Adelphi College.

SPANISH DRAMA.

Ingratitud por Amor. Comedia de Don Guillen de Castro. Edited with an introduction by HUGO A. RENNERT, Professor of Romanic Languages and Literatures in the University of Pennsylvania. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology, vol. vii, No. 1. Philadelphia: 1899. 8vo, 120 pp.

The text of the *Comedia* is preceded by an introduction of thirty-two pages which is divided into two parts; the first of these is a biographical and critical sketch, in which the editor also endeavors to fix the dates of certain events concerning the life and works of Guillen de Castro. The second part of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the manuscript and of the play itself. The editor states at the outset that nothing of importance

concerning the life of Castro has been added to the material collected by Barrera; hence we find no attempt at a succinct history of the life of the poet, but rather such an arrangement of details as will lend itself more readily to a discussion of certain questions and to the adjustment of several disputed dates in the life of the author.

On pp. 11 ff. the editor discusses the question of an edition of Castro's plays previous to the year 1618. The dedication of the first part of the edition of 1621 contains the following:

"A book-seller more eager than courteous, during my absence printed these twelve comedies adding to their errors those of the printer."

Prof. Rennert agrees with Stiefel that the words quoted can hardly refer to the edition of 1618, because both editions had the same editor¹; but he does not think that Mérimée, as Stiefel maintains, has proven that Castro was in Valencia during the year 1618; this he promises to prove in the subsequent pages. It is strange that the editor does not recur to his promise; it may be inferred, however, that the evidence which he offers consists in the citation of the two licenses to print and sell as found in the edition of 1618—the one a license from the ecclesiastical authorities of Valencia, and the other from the civil authorities of Madrid. The evidence furnished by these two licenses, as the editor points out, seems to establish conclusively the fact that the edition of 1618 was printed with Castro's full consent. Consequently, when the preface to the edition of 1621 contains an allusion to a former unauthorized edition, that allusion must of necessity be to some other edition of which no copy has been discovered. The notice of a copy of the edition of 1618, together with the licenses and title page, constitute one of the most valuable features of the introduction, both in regard to the evidence furnished by the latter as to other editions, as well as for the fact that this is the first time, so far at least as I know, that any clue as to the existence of a copy of this edition has been put into print.

Two questions arise in regard to these

¹ *Zts. f. Rom. Phil.* xvi, p. 263.

licenses which may best be explained after an examination of the documents. The ecclesiastical license, printed on p. 3 of the edition of 1618, reads in part thus:

"Nos Pedro Antonio Serra . . . por el . . . Señor . . . Arçobispo de Valencia . . . por quanto por orden y comision nuestra ha visto y examinado el Dr. Juan Pasqual este libro intitulado Primera parte de las comedias compuestas por don Guillen de Castro; y hauernos hecho relacion que no ay en el cosa contra nuestra Santa Fe Catholica, y buenas costumbres, damos licencia y facultad que se pueda imprimir en esta ciudad, y Arçobispado: con tal empero que *antes que salga a luz*, y se vendan nos trayga el Autor o otra persona por el un libro de los impressos para ver si concuerda con su original dada en el Palacio Arçobispal de Valencia a dos de Julio mdcxviii."

On p. 4 of the edition of 1618 is printed the following royal license:

"Por quanto por parte de vos don Guillen de Castro natural de la ciudad de Valencia, nos fue fecha relacion que *aniades compuesto e impresso con licencia* en la dicha ciudad de Valencia un libro de doze comedias . . . de que ante los del nuestro consejo fue fecha presentacion. Y nos fue pedido y suplicado, os mandassemos dar licencia para poder meter en estos nuestros Reynos de Castilla mil cuerpos que *teniades impressos* del dicho libro en el dicho Reyno de Valencia . . . Por la qual os damos licencia y facultad para que la dicha impression de mil cuerpos del dicho libro que de suso se haze mencion que ansi estan en el dicho nuestro Reyno de Valencia, la podays meter en estos nuestros Reynos . . . Fecha en Madrid a doze dias del mes de Junio de 1618 . . . Licencia a don Guillen de Castro . . . para que pueda meter en estos Reynos un libro de doze comedias que *ha impresso* con licencia en el dicho Reyno de Valencia . . ."

The editor referring to these two dates notices the discrepancy between that affixed to the King's license; namely, June 12, 1618, which speaks of the books as already printed, and that of the license of the Archbishop of Valencia, July 2, 1618, in which permission is given to print the book. Prof. Rennert thinks that the discrepancy might be removed if we supposed that the authentic date of the Archbishop's license was July 2, 1617, instead of July 2, 1618. But would this really obviate the difficulty? Since the license granted by the King speaks of the books as already printed, how could this license to

print be included in the book itself? Must we suppose that the licenses of the King and Archbishop were printed on a separate sheet, which was later inserted into the printed books? Both the discrepancy of the dates and the difficulty in accounting for the presence of the King's license, might be obviated if we supposed that at the time the license was granted by the King, Castro or the editor of his plays, had an edition of a thousand copies already printed with a previous license from the Archbishop of Valencia. It was one of these printed copies of the comedies which was presented to the King, or the commission appointed by him, when a request was made for a license to sell the book in the Kingdom of Castile; hence it is so plainly spoken of in the King's license as already printed. These first thousand copies were sold in Valencia; but upon receipt of the King's license to sell the book in Castile, application was again made to the Archbishop of Valencia for another license to print, which was granted in 1618; and both these licenses were included in another thousand copies which were destined to be sold in Castile.²

The editor now proceeds to prove the existence of an edition of Castro's plays anterior to 1618, and cites a portion of the prologue of the collection of comedias published at Valencia in 1625. It may be of interest to note that Barreras also quotes this prologue, the importance of which lies in the following statement:

" . . . Solo quiero advertirte que demás de imprimir estas doce comedias por hacer gusto á mi sobrina, lo hice tambien porque en mi ausencia se imprimieron otras doce, y tanto porque en ellas habia un sin fin de yerros como porque la que menos años tiene tendrá de puince arriba . . ."

This seems to be strong evidence for the existence of an edition previous to 1518. Supposing that such an edition appeared in 1607 or 1608, and that it contained the same twelve plays which were afterward published in 1618, of which, however, it must be noted we have no positive proof, we get a clue as to the rela-

² The editor is in doubt as to whether the *tassa* was printed in Valencian books, and I might add to the example referred to by him, (p. 12, note 1) that of a book before me; namely, *Blanquerna* printed at Valencia in 1521, in which no such *tassa* is to be found.

³ *Catálogo*, p. 32.

tive dates of Lope de Vega's *Las Almenas de Tora* and Castro's *Las Mocedades del Cid*, which will enable us to accept a theory that has been posited as to the relations between the two plays. This theory which the editor advances tentatively (p. 16) is as follows: To judge merely from the dedication of Lope de Vega's *Las Almenas de Tora* to Don Guillen de Castro, we might conclude that this token of Lope's appreciation of Castro was prompted by the latter's *Dido*, whereas Lope's dedication was in reality a tribute to Castro on account of the latter's *Mocedades del Cid*. One reason for this conclusion is the fact that the *Cid* is one of the characters in Lope's *Almenas de Tora*. Has it slipped the editor's notice that this same theory had already been advanced by a Spanish scholar? Menéndez y Pelayo remarks:

"Dedicó Lope de Vega *Las Almenas de Tora* al insigne poeta valenciano D. Guillén de Castro; y siendo ésta la única fábula de su teatro en que aparece el *Cid*, puede conjeturarse que la dedicatoria fué un homenaje indirecto y delicado al gran ingenio que había puesto en las tablas las *Mocedades del héroe*. Hay que advertir, sin embargo, que Lope en la dedicatoria no hace alusión á ellas al paso que alaba encarecidamente la tragedia *Dido* de D. Guillén de Castro, y transcribe un soneto que compuso en loor de ella. Es cierto también que se ignora todavía la fecha en que fueron compuestas y representadas las dos partes de las *Mocedades*, cuya primera edición conocida es de 1621, aunque de los mismos preliminares del libro se infiere que hubo otra anterior, que será probablemente la de 1618, citada por Ximeno (*Escritores del Reino de Valencia*) de la cual hasta ahora no se ha encontrado ningún ejemplar. Y como esta primera y fraudulenta edición se hizo en ausencia de D. Guillén, según él mismo declara, algún tiempo hemos de suponer para que la pieza llegara á hacerse popular y á tentar la codicia del librero que la estampó sin consentimiento de su autor. No es para mí dudoso, por lo tanto, que *Las Almenas de Tora* se escribieron después de la segunda parte de las *Mocedades*, y que la dedicatoria nació del deseo de evitar toda sombra de rivalidad ó competencia."⁴

The discovery of an edition of 1618, and the strong presumption in favor of another and earlier edition, of Castro's comedias render it perfectly plausible that Lope dedicated his

Almenas de Tora to the Valencian poet as a tribute to the genius of the author of *Las Mocedades* rather than of *Dido*.

When the editor states that everything inclines to the belief that Castro left Italy during the year 1605, and again established himself in Valencia (p. 22), he apparently overlooks the evidence furnished by Lacroix,⁵ who, speaking of Castro's connection with the *Academia de los Nocturnos*, remarks:

"C'est probablement à la suite d'une de ces aventures galantes qui aurait mal tourné que notre héros fut obligé de s'expatrier. Nous le retrouvons en effet à la cour de Naples où le vice-roi, D. Juan Pimentel de Herrera, comte de Bénavent, lui confia le gouvernement de Scigliano."

To complete the evidence, the same writer adds:

"Les lettres patentes sont datées du 1er Juin, 1607 'Pro uno anno integro et deinde in antea ad beneplacitum cum pensione, lucris, gagiis, et indumentis solitis, etc.'"⁶

The above citations show clearly that Castro could not have left Italy in 1605. Furthermore, we might be led to a similar inference from the following: 1 We know Castro to have been in Valencia on the 14th of January, 1604 (p. 8), and it seems improbable that he should have gone to Italy, assumed charge of the government of Scigliano, and returned to Valencia before the close of 1605. 2 It is probable that some time before 1616 (Prof. Rennert himself maintains before 1613 or in that year), there appeared the unauthorized edition of his *Comedias* referred to in the editions of 1621 and 1625. Now, no doubt, the fact that Castro was residing at a very great distance from Valencia was what tempted the Valencian editor to bring out an edition of the *Comedias* without Castro's consent, which perhaps he would not have ventured to do had Castro been residing within such easy reach of Valencia as Madrid, where Prof. Rennert supposes him to have been during the period in which he speaks of himself as absent from Valencia (p. 23). This, then, would lead us to conclude, not only that Castro did not return to Valencia in 1605, but that he re-

⁵ *Las Mocedades del Cid*. Texte de l'édition princeps . . . commenté et annoté . . . par Ernest Lacroix, Paris, 1897, p. 2.

⁶ *Ibid*, note 3.

⁴ *Obras de Lope de Vega*, vol. vii. Madrid, 1892, p. xxii.

mained in Italy up to, or even later, than 1613. This seems also to be the opinion of Lacroix, who supposes that Castro was called to the court of the viceroy of Naples, the Count of Lemos, the most assiduous patron of literary men, who succeeded the Count of Benevento in 1609. Finally Lacroix adds: "Il ne repa-rait, en effet, que bien plus tard à Valence, où il ressuscite l'Académie des Montañeses del Parnaso."⁸

We know that many of Castro's plays were written early, and that some of them soon became popular, nevertheless no authorized edition of his works appeared before 1618.⁹

These facts lead us to the conclusion that some unusual event in the author's life had caused him to delay the preparation of an edition of his plays. This event might well have been a prolonged stay in Italy during which the vigor of his literary energies had been somewhat abated by his military or political duties.

The editor states that in 1603 Castro probably left for Italy to assume the governorship of Scigliano (p. 23). He seems here to have forgotten the fact already noted by himself (p. 8); namely, that Castro was in Valencia on January 14, 1604; since he is mentioned by Tárrega as taking part in a *Juego de Cañas* on that day.

Part II of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the manuscript and the play itself. The editor, upon internal evidence of defective rhyme and missing verses, discredits the statements of Schack and Barrera that the manuscript is an autograph. He is also of the opinion that Act iii is falsely attributed in the manuscript to Calderón, basing his conclusion upon the belief that Castro and Calderón never worked in collaboration, and also upon the fact that the third act constitutes the weakest portion of the drama.

The play, which is here published for the first time, is divided into three *jornadas*. The last act is particularly noticeable among other defects for the weakness of intrigue. We might,

⁸ L. c., p. 2.

⁹ It should be noted, however, that two single plays, *El Amor Constante* and *El Caballero Bobo* were published in the *Doce Comedias de Cuatro Poetas Naturales de la Insigne y Coronada Ciudad de Valencia*. Valencia, 1608, and Barcelona, 1609.

on this account, be led to suppose that the first two acts are alone to be attributed to Castro, and that after his death an unknown dramatist having discovered the unfinished manuscript was tempted to bring the play to completion by writing the third act, and hoping to add lustre to his own inferior work, ascribed it to Calderón. The fact that the handwriting of the manuscript is not the same throughout does not militate against the theory, as we might suppose the completer of the play to have copied the first two acts from the original manuscript, adding his own act to the new copy.

FRANCIS L. FROST.

Johns Hopkins University.

OBITUARY.

PROFESSOR EUGEN KÖLBING.

DIED AUGUST 9, 1899.

The sudden death of the Professor of English at Breslau deprived English Philology of one of its most distinguished representatives, and the Modern Language students at this university of one of the most indefatigable and esteemed of teachers.

Eugen Kölbing was born on September 21, 1846, in Herrnhut, his father being a physician of that place. After obtaining the certificate of maturity at Bautzen, he proceeded to the University of Leipzig to devote himself to the study of the Classics and Teutonic Philology. He was here especially attracted by Zarncke's Lectures on Old Norse.

In 1868 he graduated, with his dissertation *On the Norse Parzival Saga and its Source*, and at Easter, 1869, he passed the State examination.

After absolving his probationary year (as a master) at the Holy Cross Gymnasium at Dresden, he was employed at the Gymnasiums of Schneeberg and Chemnitz, and, afterwards, for a year (1892-3) at the Strassburg Library, under Barack. It was at this time, too, that his *Investigations on the Omission of the Relative Pronoun in the Teutonic Languages* appeared, as well as a *Contribution to the Syntax of the Compound Sentence*, Strassburg, 1872, and his first Norse publication of importance, the edition of the *Riddara Sögur*,

Strassburg and London, 1872.

In 1873 he obtained the *venia legendi* at Breslau, with a treatise *On the Norse Forms of the Partonopeus Saga*, his introductory course of lectures being on early Norse literature.

Three years afterwards appeared his *Contributions to the Comparative History of Romantic Poetry and Prose of the Middle Ages, with a special consideration of English and Norse Literature*. Breslau, 1876.

We here see Kölbing breaking ground in what was to be his special domain: Medieval Romantic Literature, in the consideration of which he was especially drawn to the study of the Norse Language and Literature. His later publications in Norse are of special value, as in them he utilized Cederschiöld's criticisms of his edition of the *Riddara sögur*.

Nor was the field of the Romance Languages and Literature neglected, as is evidenced by his lectures on Old-French Literature, the publication of the reprint of the Venetian MS. of the *Chanson de Roland* (Heilbronn, 1877), of the old French source of *Amis and Amiles*, and *Hue de Rotelandes' Ipomedon* (edited with Koschwitz, Breslau, 1889, Leipzig, 1890).

In 1899 appeared Kölbing's revision of Fiedler's *Scientific Grammar of the English Language*, and in the following year his translation of the Icelandic *History of Gunnlaug Snake-tongue*, Heilbronn, 1898.

At the same time appeared the edition of the Norse and English versions of the Romance of *Sir Tristan*, with historical introduction, notes and German translation (originally edited by Sir W. Scott, 1864), Heilbronn, 1878-1882.

In 1880 Kölbing was appointed extraordinary Professor; in 1881 he published the *Elis saga ok Rosamundu* (Heilbronn); then followed *Amis und Amiloun* with the supplement *Amicus ok Amilius rimur*, Heilbronn, 1884. *Altengl. Bibliothek*, Bd. ii; the three versions of *Ipomedon*, Breslau, 1889, Leipzig, 1889; *Arthur and Merlin*, according to the Auchinleck MS. (Leipzig, 1890, *Altengl. Bibl.*, Bd. iv.); and the *Romance of Sir Beves of Hamtoun* (London, 1894, *Early English Text Society*). It was at this time that Kölbing received his appointment as ordinary Professor at Breslau (1886).

His edition of the *Siege of Corinth*, (Berlin, 1893), opens the list of critical editions of Byron's books, and it was followed after a short interval by *The Prisoner of Chillon and other Poems*, Weimar, 1896 (reviewed in MOD. LANG. NOTES in December, 1897). This was followed by a separate edition of the *Prisoner of Chillon*, in Hoops' *Englische Text Bibliothek* (Weimar, 1898).

As a co-operator in the *Altnordische Saga Bibliothek* (edited by Cederschiöld, Gering, Mogk), he then edited the *Flores Saga ok Blankiflur* (*An. B.*, Bd. v. Halle, 1896), and the *Ivens Saga An. B.*, Bd. vii, Halle, 1898).

Prof. Kölbing had also undertaken for the E. E. T. Society's *Extra Series* a parallel text edition of all the six MSS. of the *Ancræn Riwle*, and one of the *Destruction of Jerusalem*.

He had also contemplated, shortly before his death, the publication of a literary historical dissertation on *Don Juan*, and was occupied with his projected edition of *Childe Harold*, a contribution to the textual criticism of which had already appeared in 1896,¹ when failing health compelled him to seek the sanitary resort, Herrenalp.

Even here his love of work did not desert him, and it was just after placing his "imprimatur" on a sheet intended for the printer that the devoted scholar was suddenly snatched away by a fit of apoplexy.

Owing to the great distance of his Black Forest retreat from the deceased's Silesian home, only a limited number of friends and admirers were able to attend the funeral, which took place on the evening of August 11.

The Breslau Modern Language students had not, however, neglected to send a deputation of three members, who, in the picturesque costume of their society, led the procession, as it wended its way, under the rays of the setting sun, through the streets of the idyllic little town to the lofty church-yard. Here an eloquent address was delivered by Pastor R. Kölbing, of Fischbach im Riesengeberge, who, speaking on the text I. Cor. 13, 8-10: Die Liebe höret nimmer auf, Unser Wissen ist Stückwerk. eulogised the Professor's sterling qualities of heart and head, especially his devotion to his

¹ Zur Textüberlieferung von C. Harold, *Cantos i and ii*, Leipzig, 1896.

science, while Professor Schröer, of the University of Freiburg i. Br., as representative of the study of English Philology, emphasized the international reputation of the deceased, his pioneer work in the field of comparative Teutonic and Romance medieval literary history, and especially his services to the cause of English Philology, for which, by his editorship of *Englische Studien*, he contributed to secure an independent position amid its kindred sister sciences.

To these manifestations of admiration and esteem we may add Professor Appel's characterization of the departed scholar as the most productive member in the brilliant constellation of English Philologists; further, an obituary article in the last number of *Englische Studien* by Professor Kaluza, a former pupil; and lastly, a memoir by Dr. Weyrauch, in *Neuphilologische Blätter* (7. Jahrg. 1898, 1899, 20 Oct., Hoffmann, Leipzig), to which the writer is indebted for most of the facts contained in this memoir. Professor Appel, it may be explained, was the spokesman on behalf of the late professor's colleagues at a memorial meeting held on November 5, 1899, in the auditorium of the Archæological Museum, Breslau, when Dr. Weyrauch gave an eloquent resumé of Kölbing's services as a scholar and teacher, speaking as the last of his pupils. Amid the reminiscences dwelt upon by the speaker is one which the writer, glad also to discharge his debt of esteem and gratitude towards an esteemed teacher and friend, would recall with equal pleasure: the Old Norse exercises at the professor's house, when it was indeed 'a real pleasure to be initiated into the mysteries of the crabbed Old Icelandic tongue' and to learn its relation to, and affinity with, the kindred Teutonic languages.

In endeavoring to estimate Kölbing's general position as a scholar, we are reminded of an apt characterization of the German mind as possessing in a high degree

"two tendencies which are often represented as opposed to each other, namely, largeness of theoretic conception, and thoroughness in the investigation of the facts."²

Now of these two characteristics the late Professor possessed the last in a very marked

² Quoted by Buchheim (*German Prose Composition*) from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 7, 1865.

degree. His was of that order of thorough and exact scholarship, which, scorning nothing so much as superficiality and dilettantism, in the love of truth spares no pains in the investigation of the subject in hand, leaving no stone unturned to base its scientific structures on a broad and secure foundation.

The philosophical habit of mind which enables its owner to comprehend the single literary phenomena in their universal significance, to grasp what is essential in an epoch, a work, or a character, to the neglect of what is irrelevant, and to trace their development, the ability to combine the scattered fragments of knowledge into a comprehensive system, are qualities we look for rather in the philosophical historian of literature than in the philologist.

And yet we should do Kölbing injustice if we were to overlook the broad basis on which his philological and literary investigations were conducted.

True, he did not live to leave on record a comprehensive work on medieval Romantic Literature, but his researches established results of the greatest value for such a comprehensive treatment of the subject. That such comprehensive treatment of a period is often excluded by the detailed investigations of the philologist has been already hinted; it may further be owned that such minute linguistic study tends more or less to exclude the æsthetic appreciation of an author in favour of a mechanical and formal conception of the function of philology, particularly in its relation to literature, which, in the spirit of the classical scholars censured by Byron, would place the aids to literary study, the constitution of the text, textual criticism, etc., above the study itself.

"Caring more for Porson and for Porson's note,
Than for the text upon which the critic wrote."

In this way science gains, but the individual loses. Deprived of the ethical and æsthetic value of the study of literature, and compelled mainly to investigate facts and laws, the student acquires scientific method, but too often at the cost of that training of the emotions, imagination, and taste which the humanistic ideal keeps, or should keep in view.

The writer is, therefore, far from endorsing, without reserve, the attacks made on the Oxford School of Literæ Humaniores by adherents of the scientific movement on the ground of its being a mere "School of Rhetoric for the upper classes."³ The ethical and æsthetic ideals kept alive by the Literæ Humaniores course are perhaps at times too much neglected by the adherents of scientific Philology, which possessing its appropriate value in its place, is yet, in relation to literature, a mere *Hilfswissenschaft*, the ideal aims of literary culture being of more importance than the means to their attainment. In this connection Science does indeed require to be reminded of Tennyson's utterance: "She is the second, not the first."

That the late Professor, in his devotion to the principles and method of the strictly philological school, by no means intended to depreciate the literary æsthetic side of the study of English in what seemed to him its proper place is but a fair inference from his statements⁴ and practice.

Rightly or wrongly, he considered literary æsthetic criticism above the reach of immature students, for whose capacity philological investigations on questions of fact were better adapted; and yet by his lectures on the history of literature, his introductions to his critical editions of English authors—a mine of literary and bibliographical information—as well as by his recognition of the importance of the study of modern literature, of the Realien of literature, of the practical side of the study, he showed that he by no means wished to reduce it to the level of a one-sided strictly linguistic study of the older stages of the language, and, as far as literature is concerned, to mere "exercises in grammar." His lectures, it will be seen, included, besides courses on historical grammar, interpretation of Zupitza's *Old English Reader*, Chaucer, etc., also courses on the Literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; The English Drama, before and after Shakespeare; Shakespeare's Life and Works, with interpretation of *Macbeth*; Milton's Life and Works; Byron's Life and Works, with interpretation of *Childe Harold*

I; Encyclopedia of English Philology (upon the function and methods of the study, history of Philology in England and abroad, chief scholars and their achievements, etc.)—a curriculum which cannot be fairly said to exclude the modern literature, the latest periods of which Prof. Kölbing, however, left to the Lector. His notes on a modern English author, that is, Byron, it may be further noted in this connection, turn little on purely linguistic questions; namely, Etymology, and are devoted rather to elucidating the sense, for which purpose an extensive use is made of translations.

That the opponents of the strictly philological movement in their insistence on a greater attention to the study of literature as such, especially on its æsthetic side, are not wholly in the wrong will be readily admitted by all those persons inside and outside academic circles, not merely by literary dilettanti, but by philological scholars themselves, who, with all due recognition of the value of philological study in its place, yet remain true to the ideal of a refining and elevating culture, upheld by humanism. On the other hand, with all due appreciation of the value of purely literary culture, it is only fair on the part of students of literature to acknowledge the immense obligations under which their study is laid by the pioneer work of philological specialists.

If these do not always combine the special and rare gifts of the philosophic historian of literature, with the thoroughness of investigation of the philologist, they have at least produced invaluable materials for the critical and æsthetic study of literature, and we cannot but, in the case of the departed scholar, advise the perseverance with which he undertook the severe labors of a scientific pioneer of literary study, the resolution with which, like Browning's "Grammarians," regardless of the world's censure, clung fast, through good and evil reports, to his ideal of a scholarly philological method.

In taking leave of the distinguished scholar we thus deplore the loss of one of the greatest authorities, and certainly one of the most productive of laborers in the field of medieval

³ See an article on "Modern Oxford" in the *Progressive Review*, London, Horace Marshall & Son, Dec. 1896, p. 212.

⁴ See especially the article "Altenglisch, Neuenglisch und die wissenschaftliche Arbeit deutscher Universitätslehrer," *E. Stud.* xx, p. 459 ff.; further *E. S.* xxvi, 445 ff. and xli, 99 ff.

Romantic literature, especially in its international relations; further of a Byron scholar, whose profound knowledge of his subject was based on a wide reading to which his unrivalled Byron library forms a striking testimony; and last but not least, of a man whose sterling qualities of character, devotion to duty, kindliness of disposition, and readiness to promote the intellectual efforts and sympathies in the personal well-being of others, will remain perpetually enshrined in the hearts and memories of his pupils and friends.

F. H. PUGHE.

Breslau.

BRIEF MENTION.

Friedrich Kluge's new quarterly, the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, has made its appearance. The first issue, dated May, 1900, contains on eighty large octavo pages some thirty contributions to word-history, etymology, semasiology, and kindred subjects. Word-history receives the largest share of attention. The most notable contribution is Richard M. Meyer's discussion of the history of the word *Übermensch*, from its first appearance in the *Urfaust*, to the present day, and the evolution of the conception underlying it, from its primitive form in antiquity to its remarkable culmination with Nietzsche; though assailable in some of its details, the article is a model of thoughtful and scholarly *Wortforschung*. Friedrich Kluge discusses the origin of the student term *Philister*, and adduces new evidence from a manuscript volume in the Jena University library; he also publishes a soldiers' song of 1608, containing a number of terms from the rogues' jargon, a dictionary of which he is about to publish. Selmar Kleemann gives an extensive list of students' slang terms from the literature of the eighteenth century. E. Wölfflin finds the word *Glocke* as early as the seventh century, in Latin writings (*clocca*, *gloccum*). There are minor articles on word-history by W. Creizenach (*aufischen*, *Interesse*, Lessing's opinion of certain words and word-forms: *Vortrab*, *Nachtrab*, *ade*, *denken*=*opinari*, the ending *-aner*), A. Kopp (*Blaustrumpf*), H. Klenz (*Gänsefüsschen*), F. Wrede (*Sommerfrische*), J. Minor (*bekleiden*), H. Klenz (*Katzenjammer*), Dr. Kant (*Rechen*=*Enterich*). A few etymological notes by H. Schuchardt deal with *Stube*, *Kuchen*, *Wirtel*, *Schnörkel*. J. Minor quotes instances of the

use of *mantschen* in South Germany, and elucidates the meaning of *erathmen* (*Urfaust*) by a passage from one of Eichendorff's poems; O. Behaghel discusses the origin of *Stroh-wittwer*; Creizenach publishes part of a poem of 1555 in support of R. Hildebrand's explanation of *durchfallen*, and quotes an observation by Rabener on the use of *ein=talis* (*ein Mann wie*). The articles on the semasiology of certain phrases (P. Pietsch: *Kein dank dazu haben* and *im Stich lassen*; I. Bolte: *einem den Götzen singen*) are the least satisfactory of all; none of them carries conviction.

In the field of word-formation Behaghel contributes interesting articles on Nouns derived from Verbs, and on the Formative Suffix *-er*; and Kluge discusses the ending *-enser*. A. Gombert proves conclusively J. H. Campe's authorship of the *Neue Froschmäusler* (attributed by Gödeke, *Grundriss*,² ii. 509 to Stengel); the publication of this paper in Kluge's journal is apparently due solely to the fact that Gombert's evidence is derived from Campe's dictionaries.—A number of OHG. glosses found by A. Holder, notes by F. Kluge on some of the Trier glosses, and two passages quoted by Selmar Kleemann from eighteenth century writers, on account of their bearing on the excessive use of foreign words at that time, complete the contents of the number. The journal is printed in handsome German type, on excellent paper. It has the advantage of a practically clear field of its own and cannot fail, in the hands of its distinguished editor, to concentrate and to give an additional impulse to the rapidly growing activity in the domain of lexicology.

An important and most welcome bibliographical publication is announced for 1901: A. L. Jelinek, assisted by F. Dietrich, E. Roth, and M. Grolig, is preparing, as a supplement to the *Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriften-Literatur*, a *Bibliographie der deutschen Rezensionen*. The editors will include in their list reviews of books in whatever field of human knowledge, but will confine their attention to periodicals written in German. To facilitate reference, the reviews will be arranged in the alphabetical order of their authors, and there will be an index of subjects. The work is to be continued in regular annual volumes, and will be a welcome aid to scholars in all departments of learning.